THE PRESBYTERIANS, 1789-1870

Samuel Hugh Moffett
Seminar in American Church History
March 18, 1943

(Submitted to Dean Luther A. Weigle)

THE PRESBYTERIANS, 1789-1870

Introduction

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, which met for the first time in Philadelphia, May 24, 1789, was built upon a foundation of more than 150 years of Presbyterian growth in Colonial America. Cotton Mather estimated that of the 21,000 Puritans who came to New England between 1620 and 1640 more than 4,000 were Presbyterian. [1] These, however, were quickly assimilated into Puritan Congregationalism. By 1640 there were Presbyterian churches organized on Long Island, but as late as 1700 there were only 12 definitely organized Presbyterian churches in the colonies. [2]

From 1700 on, however, growth and organization was rapid. In 1706 Francis Makemie organized Philadelphia presbytery, independent both from the Scotch General Assembly and from the Ulster (Irish) Synod. [3] This was just in time to meet the flood of Scotch-Irish immigration which began in 1710 and which, as Sweet observes, "constituted the stuff out of which American colonial Presbyterianism was chiefly made." [4] By 1775 the Presbyterians were organized in a General Synod with six presbyteries, 320 churches and 153 ministers. [5]

Presbyterians came out of the Revolutionary War in a position

---

1. i.e. held Presbyterian views of church government. W.T. Hanzsche, The Presbyterians: The Story of a Staunch and Sturdy People. (Phila. 1934) p. 59 Ch. Hodge, Const. Hist

2. W. W. Sweet, Religion in Colonial America (N.Y., 1942) p. 259

3. C. A. Briggs, American Presbyterianism: Its Origin and Early History. (N.Y., 1885) pp. 139-143

4. Sweet, op. cit., pp. 250-254

5. The statistics on churches and ministers are from L. A. Weigle, American Idealism, vol. X of the Pageant of America Series (New Haven, 1928) p. 120

promising to dominate the religious life of the new country. Combined with the Congregationalists (we shall see how closely linked the two churches were), they had the ecclesiastical control of the American colonies, [1] and unlike the Congregationalists who were concentrated in New England the Presbyterian constituency was scattered in strategic positions throughout all thirteen colonies. [2] This made their College of New Jersey at Princeton "the only truly intercolonial educational institution in America", according to Sweet. [3]

The Presbyterian ministry was not only widely representative but also by the close of the Revolution it had won tremendous prestige by its almost unanimous support of the War. The only clergyman to sign the Declaration of Independence was a Presbyterian, John Witherspoon. [4] In fact, so patriotic were the Presbyterians that the Tory Dr. Inglis, rector of Trinity Church, New York, wrote in some disgust: [5]

> "I do not know one Presbyterian minister, nor have I been able, after strict inquiry, to hear of any who did not by preaching and every effort in their power promote all the measures of the Continental Congress, however extravagant."

Furthermore, the Presbyterians had the advantage of a tight-knit but flexible centralized organization with which to undertake the promotion of immediate expansion, for in 1789 the church was reorganized on a national scale into a General Assembly, with four synods and sixteen presbyteries. By its Constitution, which included the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, the church declared itself Calvinistic in doctrine and presbyterian in government, which means that it was a

---

1. Briggs, op. cit., p. 343
2. See map of Scotch-Irish settlements in America at the end of the Colonial period. W. W. Sweet, Religion on the American Frontier, vol. II, The Presbyterians. (N.Y. and London, 1936). p. 2
3. Ibid, p. 7
4. Ibid, p. 4
5. Quoted by R.E. Thompson, A Hist. of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, (N.Y., 1895), p. 57

representative system--"a government of the many by their duly elected representatives in meeting regularly assembled"--controlled by the concept of the sovereignty of God and organized about the principle that the Word of God is "the supreme and infallible rule of faith and practice."[1]

It may be well to note here in advance certain characteristics of this form of government which were to play an important role in the church's subsequent history. First, in comparison with Congregationalism, Presbyterians, while agreeing with the New England churches concerning the parity of the ministry and the essential part of the people in church government, differed in these respects: (1) Their Constitution demands of ministers and elders subscription to the Westminster Confession, and (2) Their government is a unique graded series of ecclesiastical courts, rising in power from the church session to the Presbytery, to the Synod, to the General Assembly.[2] Two other aspects of Presbyterian polity were to prove important in the church's relations to the frontier revival movement: (1) Presbyterian ministers were required to be college graduates, and (2) their ordination comes from the Presbytery, not the session or synod or the General Assembly.[3]

By 1789, then, Presbyterians occupied a commanding position in the American church scene. But with all its advantages of nation-wide prestige, influence and organization, the Presbyterian church in the next half century failed to fulfill the promise of that commanding position. It was never again so dominant as in the closing decades of the eighteenth century. It even failed to hold as its own the great immigration flood of naturally Presbyterian Scotch-Irish. Thompson estimates that by 1895 not much more than a third of the Ulster Presbyterians in America remained

---

1. Manual of Presbyterian Law (Philadelphia, 1927), pp. 32, 49

2. Ibid, p. 49

3. Constitution of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) (Phila. 1888), pp. 354-368. Records of the Presbyterian Church (Phila. 1841), pp. 499, 511

Presbyterian.[1] Earlier, by 1850 there were four million Methodists and three million Baptists in the country to only two million Presbytorians.[2] This paper is the story of what happened to the Presbyterians.

I. Co-operation and Revival

But in 1800

With their future still relatively unclouded by Baptists and Methodists, the Presbyterians faced the new century confidently. And at first their confidence was well founded, for in two important fields they made strong bids not only to retain the religious leadership of the country but also to expand with the Westward-growing nation. Those fields were denominational co-operation and frontier revivalism.

A. The Plan of Union.

When Congregationalists and Presbyterians in 1801 joined forces under the Plan of Union to push a vigorous program of missionary expansion. they dominated the vital northwestern frontier of New York, Pennsylvania and the Western Reserve. The history of this union stretches back to the pre-Revolutionary period.

Ever since the adoption of the Saybrook Platform in 1708,[3] Connecticut Congregationalism had been moving in the general direction of Presbyterian polity, for the Platform's "consociations" functioned very much like presbyteries. In 1766 regular correspondence between Connecticut's General Association and the Presbyterian Synod brought about an annual convention of Presbyterian and Congregational ministers to promote the common interests of both denominations.[4] Those were cut off by the Revolution, but fraternal relations were restored and deepened in 1792

---

3. W. Walker, A Hist. of the Congregational Churches in the U.S. (N.Y., 1907) pp. 200-213, 315-320. Massachusetts Congregationalism moved in the other direction, toward independency.

1. Thompson, op. cit., p. 69

2. Census of Religious Bodies, 1916 (Washington, 1919), p. 24. Figured by "accomodations" there were 4,345,519 Methodists; 3,247,069 Baptists; and 2,079,765 Presbyterians.

4. E. H. Gillett, History of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., vol I, p. 163f.

by a plan for exchanging delegates at the general meetings of the two bodies. In 1793 Timothy Dwight, Jonathan Edwards the younger and Mathias Burnet sat as Congregational delegates in the Presbyterian General Assembly. Two years later the exchange delegates were given the right not only to sit but to vote in the assemblies. [1] So close had the churches come that in 1799 the Hartford North Association (Congregational) made the following declaration: [2]

> "This Association gives information to all whom it may concern that the constitution of the churches in the State of Connecticut, founded on the common usages and the Confession of Faith, Heads of Agreement and Articles of Church Discipline adopted at the earliest period of the settlement of the State, is not Congregational, but contains the essentials of the government of the Church of Scotland or the Presbyterian Church in America."

However, a problem soon arose which threatened to drive a wedge between the two fraternal denominations. During the last years of the 18th century, as the tide of immigration from New England west became a flood, Congregational missionaries following their people west met Presbyterian missionaries pushing north from lower New York and the Middle Colonies. Competitive rivalry for control of the region threatened to bring the denominations into conflict. To John Blair Smith belongs much of the credit for suggesting a plan to avoid this calamity. He was president of Union College, founded at Schenectady, N.Y. in 1795 as a joint enterprise by the Presbyterians and Dutch Reformed, and which, as such, stood as living proof that active denominational co-operation was possible in the area. Concerning competition with the Congregationalists, Smith asked:

> "Is it wise, is it Christian, to divide the sparse population holding the same faith, already scattered, over the vast new territory, into two distinct ecclesiastical organizations, and thus prevent each from enjoying those means of grace which both might sooner enjoy but for such division? Would it not be

---

1. Gillett, op. cit., I, pp. 289f. The same relations were established with the General Associations of Vermont (1809), New Hampshire (1810), and Massachusetts (1811).

2. Quoted in W. H. Roberts, Concise Hist. of the Presb. Church (Phila. 1917), p. 45

> better for the entire Church that these two divisions should make mutual concessions, and thus effect a common organization on an accommodation plan, with a view to meet the condition of communities so situated? [1]

The argument so impressed Eliphalet Nott, a young Congregational minister on his way West that he induced other Congregationalists to form a number of Presbyterian churches on Smith's "plan of accomodation". [2]

In 1800 the principle of accommodation won official recognition when Jonathan Edwards the younger, who had followed Smith as president of Union College, sitting as Presbyterian delegate to the Connecticut General Association, proposed a Plan of Union whereby the two denominations might cooperate in the West. It was adopted in 1801 by both the General Assembly and the General Association. [3]

The Plan of Union had four articles: [4] the first called for a spirit of mutual forbearance and accommodation among the missionaries of the two churches; the second provided that if a Congregational church called a Presbyterian minister, it might continue to practice Congregational polity, but if trouble arose the difficulty could be referred either to the minister's presbytery or to a council consisting of an equal number of Presbyterians and Congregationalists; the third article provided similarly for a Presbyterian church calling a Congregational minister; and the fourth provided the following regulations for a church with a composite membership of Presbyterians and Congregationalists--(1) church discipline was to be in the hands of an elected standing committee, (2) appeal from its judgments was to be made by Presbyterians to presbytery, and by Congregationalists to the body of the male members of the church; (3) elected

---

1. Gillett, op. cit. pp. 392-394
2. Ibid
3. Walker, op. cit. pp. 316f.; Gillett, op. cit. pp. 396-394
4. The text of the Plan is given in W. S. Kennedy, The Plan of Union (Hudson, O, 1856), p. 150-151

deputies of the standing committee are to have the right of sitting and acting in presbytery as ruling elders.

The plan was rapidly and successfully put into operation. Wrote one of the missionaries, "The business went on because there was a mind to build, and not to contend." [1] Furthermore the spirit of friendly cooperation on the frontier was carried back to the home bases. In 1811, when the Congregationalists' American Board for Foreign Missions (organized 1810) urged Presbyterians to form a similar board of their own, the General Assembly refused, preferring instead to commend the American Board to Presbyterians for support, and the Congregationalists responded graciously by naming Presbyterian ministers and laymen to the Board. [2] A similar result was achieved in the formation of the American Home Mission Society, 1826, though here it was the Presbyterian church which was at first in the majority. By 1835 this cooperative venture had 719 agents and missionaries on the home mission field. [3]

The Plan of Union was entered into in good faith by both churches. It was designed in no way to favor one against the other. Says Walker, the Congregational historian: [4]

> "It was a wholly honorable arrangement, and was designed to be entirely fair to both sides. Both Congregationalists and Presbyterians sacrificed important features of their polities in it."

But the undeniable result of the Plan was a tremendous growth in Presbyterianism at the expense of Congregationalism.

When the Union was inaugurated Congregational churches were far more numerous than Presbyterian on the northwestern frontier, since the

---

1. Letter of J. Seward, quoted by Kennedy, op. cit., p. 153
2. Thompson, op. cit., p. 80
3. Ibid, p. 81
4. Walker, op. cit., p. 317

population was largely an overflow from New England. Central and western New York had five Congregational Associations by 1809, and between 1800 and 1815 they organized 60 churches in this area while the Presbyterians organized only 22.[1] The Plan of Union did, however, stir the latter to more aggressive action, and their influence was strengthened by a population movement from the middle colonies which modified the New England character of the population. [2] From that time on the trend was definitely toward Presbyterianism. In 1810 the largest of the New York Congregational Associations, Middle Association, became an integral part of Albany Synod, and the next year was merged into two existing presbyteries. Other Associations followed it into the Presbyterian fold. By 1822 the last of the five New York Associations had been dissolved. [3]

In the Western Reserve the story was the same. Congregationalists entered first and organized in 1805, but in 1806 they left and the Connecticut Missionary Society, unable to find Congregationalist missionaries just then, appealed to the Presbyterian Synod of Pittsburgh for missionaries. Very shortly this Congregational Missionary society was supporting Presbytorian missionaries. When Congregationalists re-entered the field in 1812 Presbyterian consciousness was too strong for them, and they were persuaded to form a presbytery instead of an association. [4] In 1825 Western Reserve was made a Presbyterian Synod. [5] Again the Plan of Union had resulted in Presbyterian triumph.

Under the Plan foundations were also laid in Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois which resulted in Presbyterian domination. The founding of

---

1. Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit., p. 43
2. Ibid
3. Ibid, p. 43f.
4. Ibid, p. 45
5. Ibid

Illinois College furnishes a good example of the process. Here, it is true, the initiative began with the presbytery of Illinois, but the work was done by Congregationalists. From Yale Divinity School went the famed Illinois Band in 1829 in response to an appeal for aid from Illinois in the building of a Christian college.[1] Julian Sturtevant became first instructor in the college, and Edward Beecher, son of Lyman Beecher, resigned the pastorate of the Park Street church in Boston to become its first president. Both were Congregationalists, but became members of Illinois presbytery, and the College eventually became Presbyterian. [2]

A. H. Ross has estimated that ultimately as a result of the Plan of Union "over two thousand churches which were in origin and usages Congregational" were transformed into Presbyterian churches. [3] Sweet thinks the figure highly exaggerated, [4] but it is at least an indication of the overwhelming trend of the Union toward Presbyterianism. The Plan operated in full force until 1837, and was still maintained by New School Presbyterians until 1852.

Just why the Presbyterians so dominated the Plan of Union is somewhat of a question. They certainly cannot be accused of bad faith. But certain factors favored them. [5] They were nearer the scene of action, for one thing. And they were stubborn Scotch-Irish, far more tenacious of the beloved auld kirk's polity than the harmony-loving Congregationalists. Furthermore, even a good many Congregationalists actually thought that the tighter Presbyterian organization was better adapted to the rough frontier than their own loosely connected system. This want of decision on the part of the New Englanders, coupled with the obvious strength of

---

1. L.A. Weigle, Commemoration Address...Jacksonville, Ill. (1933), pp. 8ff.
2. Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit., p. 77
3. A.H. Ross, The Church Kingdom: Lectures on Congregationalism...in Andover Theological Seminary, 1882-1886. (Boston and Chicago, 1887) pp. 360f.
4. Sweet, The Presbytorians, op. cit. p. 100
5. cf. Walker, op. cit., pp. 318f.; Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit. p. 46f.

Presbyterian governmental machinery, spelled triumph for the latter. As Nathanael Emmons, Massachusetts opponent of the Plan of Union, warned, "It is easier to swallow a naked babe, than a babe encased in steel," or changing the figure, when the lion and the lamb lie down together, "the lion has little to fear." [1]

Whatever the reasons may have been, the Presbyterian "lion" was tremendously strengthened by the Plan of Union. In 1807, when the Union was just beginning to prove effective, the General Assembly reported 598 churches with 365 pastors and licentiates. Twenty-three years later in 1830 it had 2185 churches with 1711 ministers and licentiates and a total of 173,329 communicants. As for the frontier where the Plan had been most actively operative, "it had been a saying that the Sabbath was unknown west of the Genesee River;" but after thirty years of the Plan of Union "the Synod of Genesee and the two adjacent now contained more members of the church than the whole General Assembly could have claimed at the opening of the century." [2]

B. The Revivals

Coincident with Presbyterian expansion on the northern frontiers as it was fostered by the Plan of Union, was the promise of wide growth along the southern frontier under the impetus of what has been called the Great Revival on the Frontier. This movement has already been described in previous papers, so we will give in bare outline only such details as will round out the picture of Presbyterian expansion.

The Presbyterian Church was not spared the debilitating effects

---

1. E. A. Park, Memoir of Nathanael Emmons, etc. (Boston, 1861), quoted by Sweet, The Presbyterians, pp. 46f.

2. Thompson, op. cit., p. 94

of the post-Revolutionary religious slump. But they weathered it, probably, as well as any, for the fires of the first Awakening were still aflame here and there in Presbyterian centers, as, for example, the revivals of 1787-89 at Hampden-Sidney college which spread through Western Virginia and North Carolina and spilled over into Kentucky and Tennessee, producing vigorous missionary activity which was shortly to flare up in the Great Revival.[1] But the cancer of infidelity had eaten into the very heart of Presbyterianism. In 1782 the college at Princeton could report but two students who professed themselves Christians.[2] In 1798 the General Assembly, alarmed at the state of the nation, observed:

> "We perceive with pain and fearful apprehension a general dereliction of religious principles and practice among our fellow-citizens, a visible and prevailing impiety and contempt for the laws and institutions of religion, and an abounding infidelity, which in many instances tends to atheism itself. The profligacy and corruption of the public morals have advanced with a progress proportionate to our declension in religion. Profaneness, pride, luxury, injustice, intemperance, lewdness, and every species of debauchery and loose indulgence greatly abound." [3]

Only a great tide of revival sweeping the country in the last years of the 18th and first years of the 19th centuries stemmed the current of infidelity. The Eastern revivals, begun notably under Timothy Dwight at Yale[4] found strong support among the Presbyterians in the middle colonies, but it was the Kentucky revival which most prominently affected the Presbyterian church. This began in 1799 under the fiery preaching of James McGready, a Presbyterian minister. In the next year the movement swept the whole Cumberland region, and the Presbyterians were joined in the work by Baptists and Methodists. In 1801 the Presbyterian Barton W. Stone added his powerful voice to the revival, which, though it

---

1. W.M. Gewehr, The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790. pp. 177-185
2. L.A. Weigle, American Idealism, op. cit., p. 141
3. Quoted by Sweet, Story of Religion in America, op. cit., p. 324
4. C.R. Keller, The Second Great Awakening in Conn. (1942, New Haven), and C.E. Cunningham, Timothy Dwight

was accomplishing a real work of spiritual revitalization and was swooping thousands into the church, [1] yet now according to Presbyterian standards seemed to be getting out of hand.

Davidson has collected details of the extravagances and disorders of the revival, listing its excesses as follows: "undue excitement of animal feeling; disorderly proceedings in public worship; too free communication of the sexes; the promulgation of doctrinal errors; and the engendering of spiritual pride and censoriousness." The physical excesses, which he classified as "undue excitement of animal feeling", included "falling, jerking, rolling, running, dancing and barking exercises and trances and visions." [2] Peter Cartwright vividly describes the "jerks":

> "To see these proud young gentlemen and young ladies dressed in their silks, jewelry, and prunella, from top to toe, take the jerks would often excite my risibilities. The first jerk or so, you would see their fine bonnets, caps and combs fly; and so sudden would be the jerking of the head that their long, loose hair would crack almost as loud as a wagoner's whip." [3]

II. Controversy and Schism

A. Revival Schism

Such revival excesses could not fail to produce vigorous opposition among sober Presbyterians, even as the less exuberant Great Awakening had done sixty years before. Furthermore, to the strict Calvinists it seemed evident that the revivalists had absorbed dangerous doctrinal errors amounting to Arminianism from their Methodist co-workers.[4] The result of the ensuing controversies was a double schism: the Cumberland Presbyterian schism, and the New Light schism.

The Cumberland schism centered about the issue of the church's educational and doctrinal requirements for the ministry. In general, it

---

1. B. W. McDonnell, Hist. of the Cumberland Presb. Church (Nashville, 1888) pp.9-19
2. Robt. Davidson, History of the Presb. Church in the State of Kentucky, pp.142-69
3. Peter Cartwright, Autobiography. p. 48f.
4. Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit. p. 89

was the Cumberlanders' lack of college education that brought on the crisis, and it was their refusal to subscribe to the unmodified Confession of Faith that prevented an early solution to the disruption. After the schism was complete, it was not the illiteracy of the schismatics, but their heresy that prevented the church from receiving them back into communion. [1]

Controversy began when the revival brought more converts into the church than its available ministers could care for, and Transylvania presbytery in 1801 authorized four men--Anderson, Ewing, King, and McClain--to exhort and catechize in vacant congregations. The next year presbytery licensed three of them to preach, though they were without college education and had been only carelessly examined as to creed. This brought opposition, but at the Kentucky Synod meeting, the revivalists pushed through a measure dividing Transylvania presbytery in two, the new presbytery being named Cumberland. In this new presbytery the revivalists were in the majority and could proceed unhindered in licensing educationally unqualified candidates. There were soon 17 of these exhorters in presbytery. [2]

Kentucky Synod, thoroughly aroused, appointed a commission, which after listening to a three-hour sermon on the call and qualifications necessary to the gospel ministry proceeded to investigate the Cumberland irregularities, and ended by prohibiting the exhorters from continuing their ministrations. Cumberland rejected the commission as an illegal intrusion of Synod into presbytery's right of ordination; [3] and the Synod responded by dissolving the presbytery and reabsorbing it into Transylvania. This

---

1. Samuel Hodge, one of the exhorters, whose educational qualifications were even lower than those of Ewing or Anderson, was taken back by Transylvania presbytery and allowed to continue his ministry when he agreed to adopt the Confession of Faith without reservation. McDonnell, op. cit., p. 67
2. Ibid, pp. 48-65; Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit., p. 91
3. McDonnell, op. cit., pp. 77-81

was in 1806. The matter was appealed to General Assembly, which in 1808 favored Cumberland Presbytery, but reversed its decision in 1809 and upheld the Synod. The Cumberlanders organized as an independent presbytery, and the schism was complete, though some of the revivalists, including McGready returned to the Presbyterian fold. [1]

In Northern Kentucky at the same time the church was being rocked by the New Light controversy. Here the central issue was doctrinal. In 1803 Kentucky Synod prepared to examine and try two revival ministers for anti-Calvinistic sentiments. At once these two and three others, the most important of whom was Barton W. Stone, announced their secession from the jurisdiction of Synod, claiming the right of private interpretation of Scripture, and accusing the Confession of Faith as darkening the doctrine of grace, "mighty in every revival since the Reformation." [2] They proceeded to organize the independent presbytery of Springfield about the principle of the Bible alone as the bond of Christian unity. The next year they dissolved the presbytery as too rigid a structure for their new church to which they gave the name "Christian", and announced the complete independence of each congregation. [3] They had notable success not only in Kentucky but also in southwest Ohio where every Presbyterian church in the area except two joined the movement. [4]

A similar movement sprang up in western Pennsylvania when Thomas Campbell, censured by presbytery for laxity in admitting to the Lord's Supper, withdrew from the Presbyterian church to form the Christian Association of Washington, Pa. to work for the union of divided Christendom. Like Stone he rejected all creeds, taking as his rule, "Where the Scriptures

---

1. McDonnell, op. cit., pp. 82-119, describes the organization and Confession of Faith of the Cumberland Presbytery.
2. Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit., p. 95
3. Ibid, p. 96
4. Ibid, p. 97

speak we speak, and where the Scriptures are silent we are silent." In 1832 Barton W. Stone and Alexander Campbell, who had succeeded his father as leader of the Campbellites, agreed to unite their movements, and formed what became a new denomination, the Disciples of Christ. A large group of Stone's followers, however, refused to follow him into the union, and continued under the name of Christians. [1]

Thus by controversy and schism the Presbyterians lost most of their gains in the revival. In 1820 Kentucky had only 2700 Presbyterians plus about 1000 Cumberlanders, as compared to 20,000 Baptists and the same number of Methodists. As late as 1830 Presbyterians numbered only about 10,000 of Kentucky's 700,000 population. [2]

B. Schism resulting from the Plan of Union:

The losses suffered under the revival controversies were almost nothing compared to the crippling blow dealt the church by the great schism of 1837, for in spite of the Kentucky divisions the Presbyterian church in 1837 was still the most influential religious body in America, and its phenomonal growth between 1800 and 1830 from 20,000 to 173,000 in thirty years had outstripped proportionately that of the fast-growing country itself. [3]

There were symptoms appearing, however, of Presbyterian weakness. Their frontier methods were no match for the Methodist circuit rider or the Baptist backwoods preacher. The Presbyterian missionary came out looking for Presbyterians; the Methodist and the Baptist didn't ask about a man's denomination, they were interested not in what he had been but in that he was going to become a Methodist or Baptist. [4] Moreover, the

---

1. L. A. Weigle, American Idealism, pp.
2. Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit., p. 33
3. L. Loetscher, A Brief Hist. of the Presbyterians (Phila. 1938), p. 58
4. Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. cit., p. 60

high educational standards insisted on by the Presbyterians not only restricted the number of ministers it could send to the field, but in some cases unfitted a man for rough-and-ready frontier life. Rugged Peter Cartwright, the Methodist, disdainfully said that these "educated preachers" reminded him of "lettuce growing under the shade of a peach tree."[1] But the greatest blow to Presbyterian expansion was the schism of 1837.

At the root of the New School--Old School division lay a growing suspicion among Presbyterians that the Plan of Union was dangerously diluting Presbyterian standards of doctrine and government. Out of this suspicion grew controversies which eventually split the church, and which were concerned with the following issues:

1) Church polity as affected by the Plan of Union.
2) Doctrinal purity as affected by the Union.
3) Rivalry between the interdenominational mission boards and the boards which were under the control of General Assembly.
4) Slavery.

Just how much of an actual issue the question of slavery was in this schism is debatable.[2] General post-Revolutionary anti-slavery feeling led the General Assembly in 1818 to pass unanimously the strongest anti-slavery resolution of its history:

> "We consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another as a gross violation of the most sacred rights of human nature; as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires us to love our neighbors as ourselves; and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ...."[3]

---

1. Quoted by Weiglo, American Idealism, op. cit., p. 150
2. See G.H. Barnes, The Anti-Slavery Impulse (N.Y.,1933); and G.H. Barnes and D.L. Drummond, Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angela Grimke Weld and Sara Grimke, 1822-1844, 2 vols. (N.Y.1934), for light on slavery as a Presbyterian issue in the thirties. Swoot, The Presb., op. cit., contends that it was a definite issue in the schism; most Presbyterian historians deny it, e.g. Thompson, op. cit., p. 122f. As early as 1838 Zebulon Crooker, op. cit. called slavery a secondary issue in the schism.
3. Minutes of the General Assembly, 1818, p. 28

But in 1830, when the first, rather negative phase of anti-slavery agitation onded, and a more aggressive phase opened, the churches became more cautious in thoir endorsement of the movemont whioh now openly demanded immediate emancipation. Presbyterians were very prominent in this phaso of the movement, and through Lane Theological Seminary provided the leadorship for the moderate abolitionists who shrank from Garrison's radicalism. Theodoro Dwight Weld, a Finney convert, seized oontrol of the crusade, and his principal support camo from New School Presbyterians. [1] By 1836 there were loosely defined anti-slavery and pro-slavery wings in the Presbyterian churoh, but it would be a mistake to call the church divided on the issue, for the overwhelming majority was moderate and indisposed to allow the issuo to assume oontroversial proportions. When the General Assembly of 1836, dominated by the New School and hence perhaps leaning to an anti-slavery position, was twelve times memorialized to take action against slavory, it merely tabled the subject, indefinitely postponing action. [2]

More positive oause of friotion was furnished by competition between the oooperative Plan of Union missionary boards and the mission boards controlled by the Presbytorians exolusively. Both types were supported by Presbyterians and both were carrying on missionary activity in tho same areas. [3] This oould not fail to cause trouble, and by 1830 Presbyterians were sniping at Societies which oould carry on the church's evangelistio program, depend on her for support, yet not be under her control. Said Joshua L. Wilson, the Western war-horse, "Tho American Home Missionary Sooiety is aiming to overthrow the Presbyterian Church." This type of opposition grew and by 1835 broadened to include attacks

---

1. Barnes, op. cit., chaps. I--IV, esp. pp. 72-87

2. Sweet, The Presbyterians, op. oit. p. 118; Thompson, op. cit, pp. 123f. But Sweet supports his oontention that slavery was an issue dividing New and Old School by citing the fact that within two years after tho division each of the four exscinded New School synods passed strong anti-slavery resolutions.

3. Gillett, op. cit., II, p

against the American Board for Foreign Missions. Only New School solidarity in the Assembly of 1836 prevented the church from setting up Pittsburgh Synod's Western Missionary Society as the official Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions in opposition to the American Board.

Probably more basic than either slavery or the rivalry of the Boards as a contributing factor to schism, was the Old School fear that the Plan of Union was Congregationalizing the Presbyterian Church and seriously compromising its governmental standards.[1] Presbyterian concern over the integrity of its church order proved stronger than its satisfaction at the tremendous growth of Presbyterianism on the frontier under the Plan of Union. Under this Plan, as we have seen, a great many Presbyterian churches grew up with Congregational origins and without strict Presbyterian organization. There were even Presbyterian churches without ruling elders, and these were accustomed to send as delegates to the General Assembly simply members of their standing committees. This practice the Assembly condemned. Old School Presbyterians derisively dubbed Plan of Union churches "Presbygational", and arose to defend the purity of the church's form of government.

However, (even more) alarming to Old School Presbyterians than the growing laxity in church government) were certain symptoms of doctrinal defection in the church traceable to the influence of the Plan of Union. Old School leaders charged that the New School, under the influence of the New Haven theology which they saw seeping into Presbyterianism through the Plan of Union, had departed from the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession (to which their subscription was required by church law. This New Haven theology was branded as Arminian and heretical. As a matter of fact both schools were Calvinistic, and the controversy was an inter-

---

1. Kennedy, op. cit., chap. IV; Baird, op. cit., pp. 574-581

Calvinistic theological debate on the interpretation of the doctrines of sin, depravity, and regeneration.

The background of the controversy is rather confusing to the mind unaccustomed to the subtleties of Calvinistic dogma.[1] Since the Great Awakening Connecticut orthodoxy had been split in two: the Old or Moderate Calvinists had inherited and preserved relatively untouched the theology of their Puritan forefathers; whereas Jonathan Edwards and his followers, the Consistent Calvinists, as they called themselves, had restated and "improved" some of the doctrines of Calvinism, notably by the Edwardean distinction between moral and natural ability,[2] his doctrine of man's relation to the Adamic fall,[3] and his view of virtue as disinterested benevolence.[4]

It was Edwards' interest in the revivals that convinced him that Old Calvinism needed these modifications in order more clearly to define and emphasize the responsibility of man for sin. His two disciples, Edward Bellamy and Samuel Hopkins introduced further modifications. Bellamy[5] substituted a general atonement theory for Edwards' limited Atonement, and thereby moved another step away from Old Calvinism. But it was Hopkins who climaxed and most ably defended this theological trend, which was named Hopkinsianism after him. From the Edwardean doctrines of natural ability, disinterestedness in benevolence, absolute submission to God, and divine permission of sin, Hopkins drew the conclusions that: (1) the use of means of grace by the unregenerate (i.e. "unregenerate doings") has no power

---

1. One of the clearest treatments of the issues is to be found in S.E. Mead, Nathaniel William Taylor, 1786-1858. See also W. Walker, The Congregationalists, op. cit., pp. 266-308; 355-360, who, however, classes Taylor as a moderate Edwardean, a view which Mead refutes.

2. i.e. Man has the natural power to turn to God, but lacks the moral willingness to do so until God reveals Himself as his highest good. Edwards, Carefuland Strict Inquiry into the modern prevailing Notions of Freedom of Will. 1754

3. i.e. Adam's sin is ours not because he possessed the sum of human nature which we inherit (Augustine, Calvin) but by the constant, creative activity of God constituting the whole race one with Adam. Edwards, Christian Doct. of Original Sin

4. Edwards, The Nature of True Virtue. 1765

5. Bellamy, True Religion Delineated, 1750. Edwards read this in mss. and publicly praised it.

toward salvation,[1] (2) man has no responsibility for Adam's sin, since sin consists in the act of sinning, not in an inherited tendency of human nature , and (3) the true Christian must be willing to be damned for the glory of God.

Such teaching at once brought fire from Old Calvinists, who as practical pastors rose to defend the use of the means of grace as making better men even of the unregenerate and bringing them at least nearer full conversion.[2] The Revolution cut off the controversy between Old and Consistent Calvinists, but only temporarily. When theological debate broke out again after the War, however, the positions of the controversialists was somewhat altered.[3] The rise of the Unitarians so alarmed both Old and Edwardean Calvinists that they ceased sniping at each other to unite in resisting the greater menace. During this working compromise there appeared a defection in the ranks of the Edwardeans. While Nathaniel Emmons on the one hand was carrying Hopkinsianism to its extreme, Mead[4] has shown that the New Haven divines on the other hand--Timothy Dwight, Lyman Beecher, and Nathaniel W. Taylor--long considered a moderate party in the line of the Edwardeans, actually broke away from the Edwardean tradition and veered back toward Old Calvinism.

Mead characterizes the difference between the Old and Edwardean Calvinists as one of temperament:[5]

> "The Old Calvinists were temperamentally inclined to the manipulation and use of 'what God did' for practical ends; the Consistent Calvinists were temperamentally inclined to speculative thinking... The former were content to know that God did certain things and to define what he did. The latter were driven to explain how God did these things and why."

Now in Dwight's defense of orthodoxy against infidelity, and in the defense

---

1. Hopkins, An Enquiry concerning the Promises of the Gospel, whether any of them are made to the Exercises and Doings of Persons in an Unregenerate State. 1765
2. See. W. Walker, The Congr., op. cit., p. 291f.
3. Mead, op. cit. pp. 95-127. 4. Ibid
5. Ibid, p. 97f., following J.G. Haroutunian, Piety versus Moralism, p. 234

of Calvinism against Unitarian horosy by Beecher and Taylor, the central appeal of the New Haven divines was neither to Scripture nor to speculative theology, for these had been ruled out by their opponents, but to the facts of the moral tendencies of the opposing systems. [1] They were moral theologians, not speculative metaphysicians, and temperamentally at least this made them more akin to the practical-minded Old Calvinists than to the abstract Edwardeans.

Mead's generalization, however, is more true of Dwight and Beecher than of Taylor, for Taylor in defending the moral implications of Calvinism was pushed to a radical modification of its traditional features--a modification which both Dwight and Beecher hesitated to accept, [2] and which precipitated the Old Calvinist revolt of 1828 in Congregationalism and the Presbyterian schism of 1837-38.

The "Taylorite" modifications are in some respects closer to Edwardean than Old Calvinism, so whereas temperamentally he inclined to the latter, theologically he was branded as a radical and outlawed Hopkinsian or Consistent Calvinist. As a result he found himself under fire from Unitarians on the one side and from all varieties of the orthodox on the other--Consistent Calvinists like Nathaniel Emmons and Andover seminary, [3] Old Calvinists like Bennett Tyler and the new Hartford seminary, [4] and Old School Presbyterians like Charles Hodge [5] at Princeton seminary--all united in attacking Taylor's theology.

These "heresies" of Taylor's, which he had paradoxically enough

---

1. Mead, op. cit., pp. 45f. 112f. 179f. The non-speculative character of the New Haven theology is seen in Taylor's assertion to his students that "if it had not been for philosophers there would never have been any dispute about 'the liberty of the will'" And no wonder. "Who ever asked what it is we see with?" and "How many have made it a question whether they think or not?"

2. Mead, op. cit. p. 69, 119ff. suggests that only the conversion of his son under Taylor's preaching allayed Dwight's doubts about his friend's orthodoxy; and Beecher in 1821 begged Taylor and Goodrich to retract their denials of original sin. Mead, op. cit., p. 213f.

3. Ibid, p. 156f. New Haven dissatisfaction with Andover's Hopkinsianism was one of the factors leading to the establishment of Yale Divinity School.

4. C. M. Geer, The Hartford Theol. Seminary, 1834-1934. pp. 16-42

5. Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, v. III, p. III.

developed to defend orthodox Calvinism against Episcopalians, Arminians and Unitarians,[1] became startlingly apparent in Concio ad Clerum, A Sermon delivered in the College of Yale Chapel, Sept. 10, 1828,[2] in which he defended the "New Divinity". The points of controversy in (his) Nat. Taylor's New School theology were these:[3]

1) The relative authority of reason and revelation. Taylor asserted the primacy of reason; the Old Calvinists upheld the supremacy of the Word.

2) The condition of the will. Taylor asserted man's freedom to choose for or against God; he had even published a sermon entitled, The Sinners Duty to Make Himself a New Heart. The Old School hewed stoutly to the Calvinistic doctrine of the bondage of the will.

3) The nature of sin. Taylor denied both total depravity and original sin, arguing in opposition to the Old School, that man's act of sinning, not his nature is sinful; that he is responsible for Adam's sin neither by heredity or constitution.

4) Divine permission of sin. Taylor defended this Edwardean thesis; his opponents accused him of thereby limiting the sovereign power of God.

5) The nature of regeneration. Taylor gives qualified assent to the view that "unregenerate doings" are a step toward regeneration, since they are prompted by man's "constitutional desire of happiness, called self-love." The Old Calvinists denounced this "self-love" as itself the sin of selfishness and hence inevitably a step away from regeneration instead of a step toward it.

In the Taylor-Tyler controversy which resulted, and which split Connecticut Congregationalism as far as Congregationalism is capable of being split save by secession, the Tylerites were supported by Old School Presbyterians,[4] who contributed liberally towards the foundation of what became Hartford Theological Seminary, thinking that thus they were building a bulwark against the New Haven theology.

---

1. Mead, op. cit. pp. 84ff., 171-221, traces the development of Taylor's theology from the Episcopalian controversy, ca. 1818, and the Unitarian tracts, ca. 1823, to the Taylor-Tyler controversy of 1828.

2. New Haven, 1828. But Presbyterian opposition had already been aroused by two sermons of Taylor's colleague, Prof. E. T. Fitch, Two Discourses on the Nature of Sin, July 1826. See Mead, op. cit., p. 218

3. Ibid, pp. 222-232; Geer, op. cit., p. 24. It is dangerous to try to align Taylor either with Old or Consistent Calvinists. On the first and last of these controversial points he stands with the Old Calvinists (Mead, pp. 109,223,227f.), but a comparison of the other points with the line of Edwardean theology outlined above will indicate that here Taylor is more nearly a radical expression of Edwardean implications than a return to Old Calvinism. As a matter of fact, both schools of thought disowned him.

4. S.J. Baird, A Hist. of the New School, and of the Questions Involved in the Disruption of the Presb. Church in 1838. (Phila. 1868). Baird, an Old School partisan traces clearly Presb. relations in the New England controversy.

But before long even Presbyterians found themselves infected with the new doctrine, and old guard leaders were quick to blame the contamination on the Plan of Union which had brought Presbyterianism into such close contact with New England Congregationalism. Within a year after Taylor's Concio ad clerum, Albert Barnes, a Princeton graduate and pastor of the strong Morristown church, preached a decidedly Taylorite sermon on The Way of Salvation. That was in 1829, and when he was shortly thereafter called to the pastorate of First Church in Philadelphia, the mother church of the denomination, Ashbel Green led Old School opposition to his installment. From then until 1836 Barnes moved in the center of heresy trials which rocked the church. New School men rallied to his support. Twice his case came before General Assembly, but both times he was vindicated thanks to a large body of moderates represented by Princeton Seminary, which was Old School theologically but favored a peaceful settlement between Old and New School wings. [1]

Other heresy trials flared up across the country--[2] George Duffield in 1832, two professors and President Edward Beecher of Illinois College in 1833, President Lyman Beecher of Lane Seminary in 1835. All were acquitted, but controversial fires grew hotter.

Up to 1836 however, the Princeton Seminary moderates were a powerful factor preventing an open break. It was the founding of Union Seminary in New York in that year by the New School, Plan of Union leaders that decided the issue, forcing Princeton from its moderating position into definite alignment with Old School forces. [3] This, together with the extreme measures of the New School when they dominated the Assembly of 1836 and repudiated the Pittsburgh Missionary Society and reaffirmed the

---

1. Thompson, op. cit. p. 109f.
2. Ibid, p. 108f.
3. Ibid, p. 113ff.

the elective-affinity principle in organizing presbyteries, produced such an Old School reaction in the Church that division was almost inevitable in the next Assembly.

The General Assembly of 1837 [1] was nothing if not courageous. The Old School was at last in the majority. Without hesitation they expelled from the church almost one-half of its membership--four synods, 553 churches and over 100,000 members--more than the entire church could have boasted in 1801 when the Plan of Union was inaugurated. The Assembly then proceeded to abrogate the Plan of Union. [2] It separated itself from the interdenominational home and foreign missionary societies, adopting Pittsburgh's Western Missionary Society as its official Board of Foreign Missions. Only then was it satisfied that Presbyterianism had been preserved pure and undefiled.

This abrupt and tremendously severe action caught the New School by surprise. Rallying at Auburn in August its leaders laid plans to regain their lost standing. But in the tumultuous Assembly of 1838 [3] they failed. Commissioners from the exscinded presbyteries, failing to secure recognition from the moderator, stood in the aisles and organized themselves as a counter-General Assembly [4] and adjourned to another building. The separation was complete. The Presbyterian church was divided into two almost equal denominations, having the same name, the same standards of doctrine, government and order, covering the same territory, yet separate and hostile.

Crippled by its bisection the Church turned to face the era of greatest national expansion, and failed to meet the challenge of a growing country. [5] It was small consolation to hear Henry Clay pronounce that the oratorical display in the Assemblies had been finer than anything Congress could produce. [6]

---

1. Minutes of General Assembly, 1837. Gillett, op. cit. II, pp. 528-531. Z. Crocker, The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church, an eye-witness account.
2. First local repudiation was by Congregationalists at Jacksonville, Ill. in 1833.
3. Minutes, 1838. 4. Civil Courts declared the Old School the legal successor.
5. Thompson, op. cit. p. 126 gives figures. 6. Ibid, p. 126

III. REUNION

It took thirty-two years to heal the breach. Those thirty-two years saw the rise of the Baptists and the Methodists; and they saw another great schism tear the Presbyterians in two.

But Presbyterians did not stand still. Of the two branches the growth of the Old School was more rapid,[1] but the New School was more active in the reform movements of the time. It furnished leaders like Lyman Beecher and Albert Barnes to the Temperance cause. In Barnes' church at Morristown was formed the first temperance society in America. It pledged its members to limit their consumption of "apple-jack" to a pint a day.[2] As we have already noted, Presbyterians were outstanding in the anti-slavery crusade. The first anti-slavery candidate for the presidency, James G. Birnie,[3] was a Presbyterian; as was also the first abolitionist martyr, Elijah P. Lovejoy,[4] a graduate of Princeton Seminary.

Unfortunately, Presbyterian leadership in the abolitionist movement only added new controversy to the already divided church. As early as 1845 two presbyteries,[5] one New School and one Old School, seceded from the General Assemblies on the grounds that the churches were equivocating on the slavery question. They joined to form the small Synod of

---

1. Gillett, op. cit., II, pp564, 568f. gives the following figures: In 1840 the New School had 1260 ministers to the Old School's 1304, in 1864 it had 1644 to the other's 2656 (in 1860). Similarly in membership in the same years the New School increased from 102,060 to only 126,000, while the Old School grew from 138,074 to 292,927.
2. Thompson, op. cit. p. 130
3. Barnes, op. cit. p. 176. Pathetically he won barely 7000 votes in 1840.
4. Thompson, op. cit. p.
5. Ripley, Ohio; and Mahoning, Penna.

of the Free Presbyterian Church, which naturally took a firm stand against slavery. [1] In 1853 the New School Assembly which was taking an increasingly pronounced anti-slavery position, alienated its southern presbyteries by asking them what they were doing to purge the church of the slavery evil. Six southern synods, twenty-one presbyteries, and about 15,000 members withdrew in protest to form the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. [2] Meanwhile the Old School Assembly precariously preserved its unity either by walking the tight-rope of silent neutrality, or by expressing its views in carefully ambiguous resolutions, thereby incurring the censure of both the Irish Presbyterian Synod and the Free Church of Scotland, who criticized its failure to deal straightforwardly with the moral issue. [3]

Not until 1861, five weeks after the bombardment of Fort Sumter, was the Old School Assembly, and then the actual break was due not so much to the actual issue of slavery as to the hot tides of conflicting political loyalties swept up by the outbreak of hostilities. When the Assembly met many still hoped that church unity could be preserved even though national unity was breaking, but this hope was shattered when, after five days of intense debate, the Gardiner Spring Resolutions were adopted, committing the church to the Federal cause. [4] A protest by Princeton's theologian, Charles Hodge, that the church has no right to legislate concerning the political loyalties of its members proved ineffectual, [5] and Southerners, already committed to the Confederate cause, were now obliged to leave the northern church. In December, 1861, the ten seceding synods and 47 presbyteries met in Augusta to form the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. [6] Three years later this southern Old School body, and

---

1. Thompson, op. cit. p. 137
2. Ibid, p. 136
3. Vander Velde, Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union, 1861-69. p. 25f.
4. Minutes of the General Assembly, 1861
5. Vander Velde, op. cit. pp. 64-72
6. Ibid, pp. 42-105, reviews the whole situation.

the United Synod, which was the southern New School body, merged as the Presbyterian Church in the United States, [1] the name by which the Southern Presbytorian church is officially known today.

While all this was taking place, and the New School and Old School Assemblies were both dividing internally on the question of slavery, they were, nevertheless, drawing closer together on the issues that had separated them in the Great Schism of 1837-38. The Plan of Union disappeared as a bone of contention in 1852 when the Congregationalists severed their ties with the New School Assembly. [2] As a result the New School approached the Old School position on denominational boards by establishing their own permanent committees for home missions and religious education. For its part, the Old School could see that Presbyterian discipline in the New School was even stricter than its own, and that New School Calvinism had not, in Thompson's words, "run headlong through a descending career of Taylorism, Arminianism and Socinianism" as predicted. [3] Moreover, Old School rigidity had softened somewhat in its attitude toward the method of subscription to the creed, the position of the eldership, and the status of the church boards.

It was the Old School which took the initiative in reunion, and hastened to capitalize on the growing agreement between the two bodies. [4] in 1862 it proposed a "friendly interchange of commissioners". Two years later it held a reunion conference and expressed confidence in the doctrine and discipline of both churches. In 1866 when both Assemblies were meeting in St. Louis an Old School resolution proposing a Joint Committee to discuss reunion was unanimously accepted by the New School Assembly.

---

1. Thompson, op. cit., p. 159, 163. In 1869 part of the Old School Synods of Kentucky, and in 1874 part of the Synod of Missouri, which had seceded in 1865-67 in protest against state-control of the church in war-time, joined the Presb. Ch. in the U.S. Vander Velde, op. cit., pp. 183-275
2. Thompson, op. cit., p. 142
3. Ibid, p. 138
4. Vander Velde, op. cit., pp. 485ff.

The two main obstacles standing in the way of the proposed reunion were: (1) New School insistence on a loose basis of subscription to the creeds of the church, [1] and (2) Old School insistence on the right of presbyteries "to examine ministers applying for admission from other presbyteries" as to their ministerial qualifications both doctrinal and educational. But neither issue was able to prevent both the Assemblies of 1869 from voting reunion on the basis of "the standards pure and simple". At Pittsburgh in 1870 the delegates of the two Assemblies met in front of the First Church where the Old School had been meeting, and paired off, marching two by two, an Old School man with a New School man, down the streets of the city through cheering crowds to the Third Church, where the New School had been meeting. "The Presbyterian Church," says Vander Velde, "was marching from a divided past to a united future." [2]

---

1. There are three views concerning the obligation involved in legal subscription to the doctrines of the Confession and Catechisms: (1) the "ipsissima-verba" view--subscription to every word of the doctrines. This has not been the practice of the church. (2) the "substance-of-doctrine" view--subscription only to the evangelical doctrines of the standards. The New School leaned somewhat to this view, "but it is opposed to the practice of the church from the beginning". (3) Legal Presbyterian subscription is to the "system of doctrine", i.e. to the "essential and necessary articles" of the creeds, and the Church reserves to itself the right to determine what are the non-essential articles of the confessional system. "No person has a right to judge for himself as to nonessentials." Manual of Presbyterian Law, (Philadelphia, 10th ed., 1940), pp. 28-31

2. Vander Velde, op. cit., p. 521

S. H. Moffett

The Presbyterians, 1789-1870

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baird, S. J. — A History of the New School, and of the Questions Involved in the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1838. Philadelphia, 1868

Crocker, Zebulon — The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church in 1837, including a Full History of the Recent Theological Controversies in New England. New Haven, 1838

Gillett, Ezra H. — History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1864; revised 1873

Manzsche, Wm. T. — The Presbyterians: The Story of a Staunch and Sturdy People. Philadelphia, 1934

Johnson, Thos. C. — A History of the Southern Presbyterian Church, vol. X in American Church History Series. N.Y., 1894

Kennedy, W. S. — The Plan of Union: or a History of the Presbytorian and Congregational Churches of the Western Reserve; with Biographical Sketches of the Early Missionaries. Hudson, O., 1856

Lootscher, L. A. — A Brief History of the Presbyterians. Philadelphia, 1938

Mead, Sidney E. — Nathaniel William Taylor, 1786-1858: A Connecticut Liberal. Chicago, 1942

McDonnold, B. W. — History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Nashville, 1888

Presbyterian Reunion: A Memorial Volume, 1837-1871. New York, 1871

Sweet, Wm. W. — Religion on the American Frontier, vol II, The Presbyterians, 1783-1840; and vol. III, The Congregationalists, 1783-1814. New York and London, 1936, 1939.

Thompson, Robt. E. — A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States, vol. VI in American Church History Series. N.Y., 1895

Vander Veldo, L.G. — The Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union, 1861-1869. Cambridge, Mass. 1932

Walker, Williston — A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States, vol. III in American Church History Series. N.Y., 1907

Weigle, Luther A. — Commemoration Address: One Hundredth Anniversary of the Congregational Church, Jacksonville, Illinois, Dec. 10-17, 1933 (Typewritten, Yale Divinity School)

(Other bibliographical material is cited in the footnotes)

THE REORGANIZATION AND RECOVERY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

A Survey, 1775-1835

American Church History
Samuel Hugh Moffett
February 4, 1943

THE REORGANIZATION AND RECOVERY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

The story of the break-up of the Church of England in the Colonies and its reorganization and recovery as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States may be roughly divided into four periods:

1. The Church Uprooted, 1775-1780
2. The Church Reorganized, 1780-1789
3. The Church Stagnant, 1789-1811
4. The Church Revitalized, 1811-1835

Somewhat arbitrarily we have chosen 1835 as the terminus ad quem of the period of recovery and progress for in that year died Bishop White, the last of the original bishops and guiding spirit in the formation of the new church.

I. The Church Uprooted, 1775-1780

On March 10, 1776, the good rector of King's Chapel, Boston, entered these words in his church register:[1]

> "An unnatural Rebellion of the Colonies against His Majesties Government obliged the Loyal Part of his subjects to evacuate their dwellings and substance, and to take refuge in Halifax, London and elsewhere: By which means the public Worship at King's Chapel became suspended, and is like to remain so, till it shall please God in the Course of his Providence to change the Hearts of the Rebels, or give success to his Majesties arms for suppressing the Rebellion....." H. Caner."

That was the last true Episcopalian entry in the register. For the next five years patriotic Congregationalists replaced Tory Episcopalians within King's Chapel, and when in 1782 members of the original

---

1. F. W. P. Greenwood, History of King's Chapel. p. 133

congregation returned, the man they chose and ordained as rector in defiance of episcopal opposition was a Unitarian. The first Episcopal church in New England became the first Unitarian church in America. [1]

The loss of King's Chapel is only a symbol of the shattering blow dealt the Church of England in the Colonies by the Revolution. It was left in fragments scattered from Maine to Georgia, without a head, robbed of its possessions, harried and persecuted, its churches in ruins and its ministers in exile.

In 1775 the Church had 250 clergymen in the Colonies. [2] Just how many were left after the war when peace was declared in 1783 we do not know, for the records of the paralyzed church in this period are incomplete. But the Rev. Samuel Parker of Boston in a letter to William White of Philadelphia, June 21, 1784, sadly admits that he can number only 20 clergymen left in all New England, and 14 of these were concentrated in Connecticut. [3] Furthermore, five of these 14 remaining Connecticut Episcopalian ministers left the country in the post-war flood of Tory emigration, arriving with 30,000 refugees, a large proportion of which were Episcopalian, in Nova Scotia. [4] In Pennsylvania William White was at one time the only Anglican minister left by war in the entire state. [5] A typical case here was that of the Rev. Mr. Adams in York who was doused in a pond three times by patriots and warned to leave. He left. [6]

In New Jersey all but one Anglican church was closed. [7] In New

---

1. Greenwood, op. cit. pp. 135-143
2. D. Dorchester, Christianity in the United States. p. 256
3. Quoted in C.R. Batcheldor, A History of the Eastern Diocese. pp. 97-99. All but three of the Anglican clergy left Mass. during the war; New Hampshire was without clergy, as was Rhode Island.
4. E.E. Beardsley, Hist. of the Episcopal Ch. in Connecticut, p. 352
5. W.W. Manross, Hist. of the American Episcopal Church, p. 180
6. S.D. McConnell, Hist. of the American Episcopal Church, p. 210
7. Manross, Hist., op. cit. p. 181

returned, the man they chose and ordained in defiance of episcopal opposition

York Episcopalians either fled the country like Myles Cooper, president of King's College (Columbia), or huddled together in New York city which remained throughout the war in British hands.[1] This was the price the Church in the North paid for its Toryism.

But Toryism alone does not account for the low ebb of Episcopal fortunes, for damage was greatest of all in the South [2] where a larger proportion of Churchmen supported the Revolution. Outwardly the established Southern Church had seemed far stronger than its struggling Northern branches. But nominal church membership, the curse of establishment, sapped the vitality of the Church in the South, and with disestablishment the Church progressively disintegrated after the war, whereas in the North where Episcopalianism had to be a matter of conviction, not convenience, the Revolution only temporarily checked its growth. Connecticut, where the Church was most pronouncedly Tory and whose first bishop to the end of his life was actually receiving half-pay pension from the British for his services as chaplain in the Royal army,[3] was the first to recover as a Church from the paralysis of independence from the English Church. [4]

To sum up the causes of the Episcopal decline in this period we may list the following factors: 1) opposition aroused by the Church's Toryism, 2) disestablishment and the loss of state support,

---

1. Manross, History, op. cit. p. 178f.
2. Hawks, the historian of the church in Virginia, writes, "When the Colonists first resorted to arms Virginia contained 95 parishes, 164 chapels and churches and 91 clergymen. When the contest was over she came out of the war with a large number of her churches destroyed or injured irreparably, with 23 of her 95 parishes extinct or forsaken, and of the remaining 72, 34 were destitute of ministerial services, while of her 91 clergymen 28 only remained,... Of these 28...13 had been driven from their cures by violence or want." Contributions, p. 153f, quoted by Dorchester, op. cit., p. 267
3. W.S. Perry, Hist. of the American Episcopal Church, vol II, p. 120
4. W.W. Manross, Episcopal Church in the U.S. 1800-1840. pp. 27-28

3) the severing of the ties with the Bishop of London and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which left the Church without the integrating bonds of the authority of the episcopacy or the support of the missionary society, 4) loss of members by emigration or by defection to the Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists[1], 5) internal disruption caused by the loss of church property and the uprooting of ministers[2], 6) internal weakness, such as the indifference of the members and the corruption of the clergy[3] to which the prevailing Deistic philosophy of the times contributed, and 7) democratic opposition to aristocratic tendencies both in Episcopal organization and upper-class membership.[4]

After the Revolution the Church of England in the Colonies was no more. The overwhelming and depressing weight of the factors we have just enumerated left its dispersed fragments without name, without head, without support, without public respect. The Episcopal Church, as Bishop Williams has aptly said, was regarded as "a piece of heavy baggage which the British had left behind them when they left New York and Boston." 5

---

1. W. M. Gewehr, The Great Awakening in Virginia, 1740-1790

2. McConnell, op. cit., p. 210f. gives a partial list of harried and persecuted and banished Episcopal minister, compiled chiefly from Sabine's Loyalists in the Revolution.

3. William Meade gives a contemporary picture: "It is a melancholy fact that many of them had been addicted to the race-field, the card-table, the ball-room, the theatre,--nay, more, to the drunken revel. One of them, about the very period of which I am speaking, was, and had been for years, the president of a jockey-club. Another, after abandoning the ministry, fought a duel in sight of the very church in which he had performed the solemn offices of religion. Another preached...four times a year against the four sins of atheism, gambling, horse-racing, and swearing, receiving one hundred dollars--a legacy of some pious person to the minister of the parish--for so doing, while he practised all of the vices himself... Nothing was more common, even with the better portion of them, than to celebrate the holy ordinance of Baptism, not amidst the prayers of the congregation, but the festivities of the feast and the dance, the minister sometimes taking a full share in all that was going on." Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia, vol I, pp. 18,19

4. Manross, History, op. cit. pp. 183ff.
5. Quoted in H. L. Burleson, Conquest of the Continent. p. 36

II. The Church Reorganized, 1780-1789

Disastrous though its was, tho decline of the Episcopal Church must not be exaggerated. If it were indeed brought so low as it is sometimes painted, how can we explain its achievements in the next decade immediately following the Revolution.

Even before tho end of the was, in Maryland in 1780, tho Church be an to show signs of new life and took stops to securo its property rights from confisoation as British. In Connooticut within a year from the declaration of peace tho Church secured what no establishment had been ablo to win for the American church, a bishop-- the laok of whioh had crippled the growth of Episcopalianism in the Colonies for 175 years. The year following, in 1785, the Church hold its first General Convention and beoame a nationally organized body, no longer a Colonial appendage of Anglicanism, but an American Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church in America.

In this triple advance the names of three Churchmen stand out: William Smith of Maryland who almost saved the church's property interests; Samuel Seabury of Connecticut who secured the Apostolio succession in the episcopate; and William White of Philadelphia who forged an organizational struoture for the orphaned church.

William Smith[1], ousted as provost of Philadelphia Collogo (the U. of Pennsylvania), by the war, one of the most learned men in the Colonies, took refugo in less troubled Maryland where he founded Washington Collego. Before the war ended he began to grapple with tho

---

1. Perry, History, op. cit. vol. II, pp. 2-5; McConnell, op. oit. pp. 217-222; C.C. Tiffany, American Church History series, vol VII, History of the Protestant Episcopal Church, pp. 303-312

problem of who was to fall heir to the estates of the Church of England in the Colonies--churches, glebes, parsonages, landed endowments and tax-revenues. Would it be secularized as state property, or would it be turned over to the church, and if so, what church? It would obviously not be returned to the Bishop of London, and there was no such thing as an American Episcopal church. So in 1780 Dr. Smith called a conference of the Episcopal clergy and laymen in Maryland to establish the Episcopal church in that state as a corporate body which could legally claim church property as the successor to the Church of England in Maryland. The group took as its name, the Protestant Episcopal Church, and petitioned the state legislature for the right to raise money for the support of its parishes. In 1783 the group declared itself the legal and actual successor to all Church of England property in the state. A similar process was followed in Virginia, but nowhere in the Colonies did the new church succeed in retaining all the property that might rightfully have been hers. Most conspicuous was its failure to win the right of support by public taxation.

It was characteristic of the rather decadent Southern churches that their first moves were secular and concerned with property rights, whereas the Northern bodies moved first to protect the Church's spiritual interests. A month before peace was formally declared, in March 1783 ten of the fourteen Connecticut clergy, meeting secretly lest a conference of Episcopalians arouse opposition and violence, came together at Woodbury to discuss means of saving the church.[1] Quietly, without formality or written record, they selected Jeremiah Leaming or Samuel Seabury as suitable to go to England and secure consecration as a bishop. Leaming declined because of old age, but Seabury consented.

---

1. Perry, op. cit. vol. II, pp. 49-51

Samuel Seabury [1] was a Connecticut man, a Yale graduate, son of a New England "convert" from Puritanism and therefore a High Churchman. He was intensely pro-British during the war, writing pamphlets against the rebels, drawing maps for the Royal army, and serving it as chaplain. But he was vigorous, able and greatly devoted to the Church. Unable to secure consecration from the English bishops due to political considerations, one of which was the oath of allegiance to the Crown they were forced to require of those they consecrated, Seabury went to Scotland to ask consecration from the non-juring bishops there who, still loyal to the Stuarts, were bound by no oath of allegiance to the British crown. On Nov. 14, 1784 at Aberdeen Seabury was consecrated by Bishops Kilgour, Petrie and Skinner.

While Connecticut was thus preserving the episcopal and spiritual structure of the apostolic church, William White,[2] the greatest statesman in the church, was directing the attention of the Middle Colonies to the necessity of organizing the Church on a national basis, lest, out off from the integrating power of the Bishop of London, the churches in the several states should remain permanently fragmented.

He was the son of a wealthy landowner, well-educated, a brother-in-law of Robert Morris, and as chaplain of the Continental Congress and rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, where Washington and Franklin were his parishioners, he was well fitted to weld the scattered fragments of the American Church into an effective national body, for he had the confidence of the American public as did neither Smith or Seabury. In the summer of 1782 when hostilities had ceased but before peace was signed, and when it seemed unlikely that the English Church would ever grant rebellious America episcopal consecration, White made the first

---

1. E. E. Beardsley, Life of Seabury; Perry, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 49-57; McConnell, op. cit. pp. 223-255; Tiffany, op. cit. pp. 312-336

2. B. Wilson, Memoir of the Life of the Rt. Rev. William White; Stowe, W.H. Life and Letters of Bp. William White; and the general histories.

proposals of reorganization in an anonymously published pamphlet [1] advocating immediate action for the preservation of the church by the formation of a confederation in which the presence of a bishop would be unnecessary, and the principal of lay representation would be stressed. In 1784 he was instrumental in calling a Conference of Churchmen from all the states to discuss fundamental principles of organization. Delegates from seven states [2] formulated the following principles and recommended them for adoption:

> "(a) A Federal, Constitutional Church; (b) the several States to be its units; (c) its governing body to include both clergy and laymen; (d) the maintenance of continuity with the Church of England, making such changes in worship and discipline only as the changed political situation might render necessary; (e) to confer no powers upon the general body save such as could not be conveniently exercised by the several local churches." [3]

Most important of all, the conference assumed the power to call the churches to a Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, September 1785.

The first General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was confronted with two opposing plans of reorganization: Connecticut's episcopal plan, and White's federal plan. The former insisted that the Church has no authority to reorganize without bishops, for bishops make the Church; the latter objected that some recognized body must exist to elect bishops or unauthorized groups could gather together anywhere and form a confusion of unrecognized episcopates. Since New England was unrepresented at the Convention, [4] it was obvious that the federal plan would win. The result was a national organization divided into state units with a governing body of two orders, clergy and laity.

---

1. The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered
2. Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and Connecticut, though Connecticut took no formal part in the deliberations.
3. Summarized by McConnell, op. cit., p. 239f.
4. The distance was too great for Massachusetts, and Connecticut refused to attend because no provision had made for the presidency of Bishop Seabury. Representation was largely from Maryland and Virginia (10 of 16 clergymen, and 14 of 24 laymen. Manross, p. 195; Hodges, 300 Years.., p. 8[illegible]ff.

Significant though this forward step proved, it left the Church divided into a New England Episcopacy and a General Convention. The division threatened to be permanent, for the Convention, ignoring Seabury's non-juror succession, sent to England to assure episcopal succession through the Anglican episcopate. Upon their election by the dioceses of Pennsylvania and New York respectively, William White and Samuel Provoost, a crusty old Revolutionary, were consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the two other bishops necessary for the service, Feb. 1787. Virginia had elected Dr. Griffith and Maryland Dr. William Smith, but the former was too poor to make the trip to England, and defects of character lost Smith his episcopacy. [1]

Connecticut, hurt by the Convention's rebuff of Bishop Seabury and distrustful of White's low estimate of the episcopal office, [2] a view which seemed to predominate in the Convention, withdrew to itself and took steps to make its own New England episcopate complete and independent by the addition of the necessary two bishops. It chose Dr. Jarvis to go to Scotland for consecration by the non-jurors, and asked Massachusetts to elect and send Dr. Samuel Parker of Boston. But William White also had his eye on Parker to complete the Anglican succession. [3]

Sought after by both parties in the church, Parker proved his true greatness by declining the episcopacy altogether, and quietly moved to heal the schism in the church. His plan was masterly. He engineered the election of Edward Bass to fill the position he had declined and proposed that Seabury, Provoost and White, the three

---

1. Perry, op. cit. pp. 60-75; McConnell, op. cit., p. 253
2. As in The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the U.S. Considered
3. Perry, op. cit. p. 79

American bishops, unite to consecrate him instead of sending him to Scotland or England. With the issue of American union thus brought squarely before it, the Church met the challenge, but not without a struggle. Seabury was willing but still opposed to the low view of the episcopacy in the Convention's constitution. An even greater obstacle to union was opposition to Seabury in the Convention. Bishop Provoost almost hated him for his Toryism, and the Church's patriotic lay delegates had difficulty swallowing that British half-pay that Seabury was still receiving for his former chaplaincy. But when the Convention of 1789 formally recognized Seabury's episcopacy and allayed New England's doubts by altering the Constitution to create a House of Bishops, Connecticut entered the Convention and the Protestant Episcopal Church took its place as a united body in the United States. [1]

Immediate successes followed the happy union. Virginia and Maryland received consecrated bishops, and South Carolina, and Massachusetts, followed. Seabury confirmed 750 in Connecticut; Provoost 300 at his first confirmation in Trinity Church; Madison 600 in five Virginia parishes. [2] But the burst of activity too soon subsided; the recovery was only temporary. Confirmation was popular because it was for the first time available, but the novelty soon wore away. Bishops, little accustomed to the duties of their office, neglected diocesan visitation and acted more like parish rectors than bishops. The strong tide of dissent continued to sweep away Church property and left its ministers disheartened. The Church entered a period of stagnation.

---

1. C. R. Batchelder, History of the Eastern Diocese, vol II, pp. 130ff. Perry, op. cit. pp. 79-100; McConnell, op. cit. pp. 258-263

2. McConnell, op. cit. pp. 281ff.

III. The Church Stagnant, 1789-1811

The period which extends roughly from 1789-1811 has been called by Tiffany "a period of suspended animation and feeble growth". [1] The Church was reorganized, but unfortunately successful reorganization does not guarantee vitality and progress. At any time in the next 20 years the new Church might have died almost unnoticed in turbulent America. In fact John Marshall, the famous Chief Justice, though a devout Episcopalian, remarked when asked for a contribution to the theological seminary at Alexandria "that it was a hopeless undertaking and that it was almost unkind to induce young Virginians to enter the Episcopal ministry, the Church being too far gone over to be revived." [2]

True, the Church at last had its bishops. Seabury in Connecticut was probably the ablest diocesan of the lot, but even he was ignored or ridiculed by the greater part of the people. Congregational ministers, not to be outdone by the presumptious Episcopalian, began calling each other "Bishop", [3] and Seabury poured no oil on troubled waters by issuing an "Address to Ministers and Congregations of the Presbyterian and Independent persuasions..." charging them to return to the fold by "relinquishing those errors which they, through prejudice, had imbibed." [4]

The other bishops had little conception of what the episcopal office really required. White, great statesman though he was, lost his

---

1. Tiffany, op. cit. p. 385
2. Meade, Old Churches..., op. cit., p. 50
3. Beardsley, History of the Episcopal Church in Conn. op. cit. p. 368
4. McConnell, op. cit. p. 289

nationwide vision and turned parochial, rarely leaving Philadelphia to visit his diocese and utterly neglecting the hundreds of Church people moving to Western Pennsylvania, Virginia and Eastern Kentucky. [1] In fact he protested against the idea that a bishop should "always be engaged in visitations", asserting that a bishop's time is "as much due to his own family as any any of his services to the Church." [2] Provoost in New York, who had been elected for political not religious reasons anyway, threw up the sponge and retired from the episcopate to translate Tasso and study botany, not even bothering to attend church. [3] Madison of Virginia, after one swing around his diocese, devoted himself so entirely to his duties as president of William and Mary College that it was currently rumored that he had lost his faith. [4] Uzal Ogden, bishop-elect of New Jersey, turned Presbyterian when his election was not confirmed by the Convention. [5] South Carolina would not even accept a bishop for three years, so firmly un-episcopal was the Episcopal church in that state. [6] Vermont almost gave the episcopate to a cheat and a charlatan, Samuel Peters; [7] and when Samuel Parker, bishop of Massachusetts, died in 1804, interest in the church was so low that the state did not obtain another until 1811, and then only by uniting with other New England states to form the Eastern diocese. [8]

Illustrative of the sad state of the episcopate at this time is the story of the consecration of Hobart and Griswold in 1811. The

---

1. Stowe, Life and Letters of Bp. White, pp. 127-136
2. Quoted by McConnell, op. cit., p. 285
3. Perry, op. cit. pp. 151f., 190
4. Wm. Meade, op. cit. pp. 28-29
5. Perry, op. cit. p. 127f.
6. Manross, Episcopal Church..1800-1840, op. cit. p. 42
7. L.A. Weigle, American Idealism, p. 135; Perry, op. cit. p. 180
8. McConnell, op. cit. p. 285f.

American Church then had six bishops, and only three were necessary for the consecration service. But Bishop Madison of Virginia thought the event not important enough to call him away from his college. Claggett of Maryland and Moore of New York were ill, the latter so seriously he could not move. Provoost, who had emerged from a ten-year retirement to lead the opposition to Hobart's election, was not only ill, but seemed unlikely to consent to take part in his opponent's consecration. Only Bishops White of Pennsylvania and Jarvis of Connecticut seemed available. Finally Provoost relented, but at the last moment a difficulty arose which all too clearly reveals the condition of the Church. McConnell describes it thus: [1]

> "He (Provoost) had adorned his head with a wig, and the other bishops wore only their hair. It was solemnly discussed whether or not so important a function could be performed wigless. Dr. Duche offered to lend Bishop White his for the occasion. But Bishop Jarvis, in that case, would be singular. Bishop White adduced the high example of Archbishop Tillotson, whose portrait shows him wigless. This illustrious precedent was deemed satisfactory for the two, while Bishop Provoost should uphold ancient usage in his Episcopal headdress. The question being settled, the services proceeded, and the three surviving men of the old order laid their hands upon Bishop Hobart, the first of modern Churchmen."

It is little wonder, perhaps, that bishops who could argue about wigs should have made the greatest strategical blunder in the churchmanship of the period--the failure of the Episcopal Church to take immediate advantage of Thomas Coke's proposals of Episcopal-Methodist reunion in America. In 1791 Coke wrote to Seabury and White, without Asbury's knowledge, outlining a plan of reunion involving the consecration of Asbury and Coke as "bishops of the Methodist society in the Protestant

---

1. McConnell, op. cit. p. 285f.

Episcopal Church." White and Seabury, arch-conservatives, were guarded in their replies;[1] only Bishop Madison seemed at all concerned about the dangers of permanent disruption between the two bodies. His fellow bishops, while half-heartedly agreeing with him, allowed the House of Deputies at the Convention of 1792 to brush aside the proposals of reunion as "preposterous", and "tending to produce distrust of the stability of the system of the Episcopal Church..." [2] The opportunity was lost forever, and the thousands upon thousands of Methodists never returned to the fold.

The Church as a whole had no more vitality than its leaders. In Connecticut and New York where it was strongest it only held its ground. Elsewhere it disintegrated through party strife, or indifference or dissent. In Virginia the condition of the Church was almost hopeless. The best that good Samuel Davies, afterward president of Princeton, could say of it was, "I have reason to hope that there are and have been a few names in various parts of the Colony who are sincerely seeking the Lord and groping after religion in the communion of the Church of England". [3] And when, in 1802, the Church's property was torn from it by a hostile legislature, even the faithful lost heart.

> "Glebes and churches were sold for a song, (reports McConnell). The proceeds, which, it had been enacted by the Legislature, should be 'used for any public purpose not religious', were embezzled by the sheriff's officers. Guzzling planters toped from stolen chalices and passed the cheese about in patens. A marble font became a horse-trough. Communion plate, the gift of the good Queen Anne, adorned the sideboards of officers of State and country gentlemen. The clergy in large numbers laid

---

1. Wm. White, Memoirs, pp. 408-413 gives the correspondence in full. See also Tiffany, op. cit. p. 405
2. Ibid
3. Quoted by Wm. Meade, op. cit., p. 15f. who applies the same condemnation to his own period.

> down their spiritual callings.. No convention was held from 1800 to 1812. When only 16 could be assembled. When they adjourned it was with no expectation of ever meeting again. 'They fear," said the house of Deputies to the Bishop, 'the Church in Virginia is so depressed that there is danger of her utter ruin.' The people had already gone from her. The Rev. Devereux Jarratt declares that before the Revolution he had often nine hundred or a thousand communicants; now, since the Methodists have done their work, he can scarcely find forty hearers." [1]

By 1811 when William Meade was ordained deacon it "created surprise and was a matter of much conversation" that a young Virginian of good family and education, a graduate of Princeton, should seek to enter the ministry of the Episcopal Church. [2] South Carolina, though it obtained a bishop in 1795, waited 16 years, until 1816 for its first confirmations. [3] In North Carolina "all was dark and hopeless" from 1794 to 1817. [4]

However, the year 1811, a year in which young Episcopalians at William and Mary College were debating the questions Whether there be a God? and Whether the Christian religion had been injurious or beneficial to mankind? [5] nevertheless marks the turning point in the fortunes of the Episcopal Church.

---

1. McConnell, op. cit., pp. 287f.
2. Meade, op. cit., p. 30
3. Perry, op. cit., p. 189
4. Ibid, p. 146
5. Meade, op. cit., p. 29

IV. The Church Revitalized, 1811-1835

In the year 1811 John Hobart and Alexander Griswold were consecrated bishops of New York and the Eastern diocese respectively. These two men, together with Richard Channing Moore, consecrated bishop of Virginia in 1814, were to be the leading instruments in the recovery of the Episcopal Church. There were other contributing factors, of course,--there was the quickening influence of the Evangelical Party in the English Church, a spirit of warmth and devotion that crossed the ocean; [1] there was also the final recovery of the church from the stigma of Toryism by its patriotic support of the War of 1812. [2] But it was largely through the efforts of a new, aggressive episcopate represented by men like Hobart, Griswold and Moore that the Church was built up.

John Henry Hobart,[3] Princeton graduate and theological pupil of Bishop White, was neither a brilliant thinker nor scholar, but his fiery spirit and natural qualities of leadership coupled with his lofty regard for the Church made him its outstanding champion. He was a High Churchman, and even before his elevation to the episcopate had engaged in vigorous debate with Dr. John M. Mason, a prominent Presbyterian, defending the episcopate and attacking Calvinism. Though he came off second best in the argument, [4] his vigorous partisanship established him as head of the High Church party and widely published before a hitherto indifferent public the claims of the Episcopal Church. Even Mason, his opponent, was so impressed by his sincerity that he said, "Were

---

1. Perry, op. cit., p. 192
2. McConnell, op. cit., p. 292
3. See sketches of his life in Manross, Episcopal Church.., pp. 45-57; Perry, op. cit., pp. 149-172; Tiffany, op. cit., pp. 410-417
4. Manross, Episcopal Church...1800-1840, op. cit., p. 47

I compelled to intrust the safety of my country to any one man, that man should be John Henry Hobart." [1]

Hobart's High Churchmanship was fortunately supplemented by an evangelical zeal in preaching grounded in thorough Bible study. [2] The phrase he made famous as the ideal of his Church was "Evangelical truth and apostolic order." When he became bishop he threw all his energies into binding the expanding New York frontiers. Happily he had all the resources of the richest parish in the country behind him--Trinity in New York City. He had already organized the diocese for the task: A Society for the Promotion of Religion and Learning (1802) was ready to support missions and theological education; Bible and Tract Societies (1809 and 1810) supplemented this work. As bishop he founded the New York Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Society and organized the Protestant Episcopal Press.

Results justified the labor of organization. Within one year the new bishop had confirmed 500 persons and consecrated four new churches; the next year he added 1,100 confirmations. He was constantly ranging up and down his diocese, and burned himself out in the work. As he set out on his last visitation his wife warned him, "You are undertaking too much." "How can I do too much for Him who has done everything for me," he replied. [3] In 1801 New York had but 19 Episcopal ministers; at Hobart's death in 1830 the western part of the state alone had 55 ministers in as many parishes, and in 1838 was made into a separate diocese, the first which did not cover a whole state. [4]

Quite different, but equally successful, was the work of

---

1. Tiffany, op. cit., p. 412
2. Perry, op. cit., pp. 154-5
3. L. A. Weigle, op. cit., p. 156
4. Manross, Episcopal Church...1800-1840, op. cit., pp. 38, 57

Alexander Viets Griswold [1] in New England, and of very different character and background was he from Hobart. A Low Churchman and man of the plain people, like Lincoln he picked up his education stretched out on the hearth before the fire late at night after a hard day in the fields. Even after his ordination he was forced to supplement his meager salary by teaching school in winter and working as a day-laborer in summer. Puritan ancestry made him a man of earnest spiritual life.

Hobart came from rich Trinity parish, but so impoverished were the New England churches outside Connecticut that the four states of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont and New Hampshire were forced to unite in support of one bishop and were merged into the Eastern Diocese (1810). The whole diocese had only three strong churches--Boston, Providence, and Newport--and 16 clergymen. Population was declining as emigration west gathered volume. But one factor at least was favorable--the Calvinism of the Puritans was beginning to break down, and this opened the field to proselyting by non-Calvinistic denominations.

Unexpectedly elevated to this episcopate in 1811, Griswold worked with sober thoroughness and a warm devotion which brought revivals in several of his parishes. The first year he confirmed 1,212 persons. Every year he traveled by stage or horseback through his diocese, encouraging prayer-meetings, revivals and Bible Societies. He was one of the first in the Church to see the need of missionary work beyond the frontiers of the organized dioceses. How well Griswold built can be seen in the statistics of his diocese.[2] At his election Vermont had actually been without a church building, but as early as 1832 it was already able to

---

1. See Tiffany, op. cit. pp. 417-424; Perry, op. cit., pp. 173-187
2. Batcheldor, Hist. of the Eastern Diocese, op. cit., pp. 87,97,103-4, 394, 397f.; Manross, Episcopal Church...1800-1840, op. cit., p. 60f.

support its own bishop and had 16 churches; Massachusetts had had only nine clergymen and about 300 communicants, but three years before his death it could boast 43 ministers and 3010 communicants; Rhode Island had 18 churches instead of only four. The four states which at his election had barely been able to support one bishop, shortly after his death (1844) had all been made separate dioceses supporting bishops of their own.

In Virginia the work of revival was carried on almost entirely by the evangelical Low Churchmen, men like Bishop Moore and his earnest assistant William Meade. Moore was a great preacher. Tiffany quotes the following story of his power in the pulpit: [1]

> "He had been preaching at one of his usual stations in the afternoon, and, the ordinary closing devotions being ended, pronounced the benediction. But not a person moved to retire. All seated themselves in the attitude of fixed and solemn attention. A member of the church arose and said, 'Dr. Moore, the people are not disposed to go home. Please to give us another sermon.' At the close of that a like scene was repeated. And the services were continued, until, at the close of a third sermon, the preacher was obliged to say, 'My beloved people, you must now disperse, for, although I delight to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation, my strength is exhausted and I can say no more.' Under these sermons many were awakened to righteousness."

With preaching like that the church was bound to revive. Moore found in his diocese when he arrived in 1814 only four or five active ministers, the church was heroless. But the warm-hearted, fifty-year-old bishop labored untiringly, and after 27 years of service left Virginia with almost 100 Episcopal clergymen serving 170 parishes. [2]

Similar revivals of Episcopalianism occurred in other states--in South Carolina beginning as early as 1804; and in North Carolina under able Bishop John Stark Ravenscroft.[3] In Pennsylvania Bishop White shook

---

1. Meneshaw, Memoir of Bishop R. C. Moore, p. 66, quoted by Tiffany, op. cit. p. 426
2. Tiffany, op. cit., p. 429
3. Ibid, 449ff.; Manross, Episcopal Ch...1800-1840, op. cit. p. 63,65

off enough of his parochialism to make his first and only visitation west of the Alleghenies, but progress in the state was marred by strife between High and Low Church parties. [1] The work in Maryland continued slowly and unspectacularly to improve as did that in New Jersey, but Georgia and Florida remained mission fields until after 1840. [2]

By 1835, however, the Church had more than recovered from the disasters of the Revolutionary period. Its 763 ministers [3] were three times the number of even its pre-war strength, 250 ministers. [4] A further index of its growing power was its ability to win converts from other denominations. Manross, in a study of 252 clergymen in the period 1800-1840, reports that 28 of these had been won from Congregationalism, 11 from the Presbyterians, 9 Methodists, 8 Dutch Reformed, 4 Lutherans, 3 Quakers, 2 Baptists, and 2 Roman Catholics and 1 Jew. [5] Furthermore, the Church's communicant membership had reached 36,418. [6]

This growth in strength and numbers manifested itself along three lines: in missionary expansion, in theological education and in the development of organizations enlisting the aid of the laity.

As early as 1801 the Church had seen the need of providing standard theological training for its ministerial candidates and asked the bishops to prepare a course of theological instruction for use in the apprentice-system of ministerial training then common. Such training was not sufficient, and in 1817 General Theological Seminary was founded

in

---

1. Manross, Episcopal Ch...1800-1840, op. cit., p. 61f.
2. Ibid, pp. 62, 65
3. Living Church Annual, Nov. 1836.
4. See above, p. 2
5. Manross, Episcopal Ch...1800-1840, op. cit. p. 70f.
6. Living Church Annual, op. cit.

in New York, and in 1824 Virginia opened a seminary at Alexandria. Maryland and Massachusetts also made efforts to organize seminaries but the projects failed. [1]

Even greater strides were taken in the direction of enlisting the laity in the service of the Church. The Episcopalians had always been distinguished for their large proportion of prominent laymen. Among others in this period it numbered Presidents Madison and Monroe, Chief-Justices John Jay and John Marshall, Alexander Hamilton, De Witt Clinton, Commodore Perry, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Washington Irving, James Fenimore Cooper and Francis Scott Key. [2] Laymen already composed one-half of the lower house of the General Convention and half of the voting power in the diocesan conventions and standing committees, [3] and their power in the local vestry is an important distinction between English and American Episcopalianism. [4] To enlist now the activity of the great numbers of laymen outside the vestry the Church made good use of the many organizations for religious work which were appearing everywhere in the early 19th century:--organizations like the Sunday School, the Bible and Tract Societies, church sewing circles and the like. Bishop White was one of the first in America to try to organize a Sunday School, and he did organize the first Bible Society in 1809. [5]

It was in the field of missionary expansion, however, that the Episcopal Church made its most decisive advance in this period, and even then it was almost too late. Four factors made it late: (1) rigid educational standards for the ministry, which kept the Church handicapped

---

1. Manross, History, op. cit., pp. 238-242
2. Manross, Episcopal Church...1800-1840, op. cit., p. 184f.
3. Ibid, p. 160
4. W. W. Sweet, Religion in Colonial America, N.Y., 1942, p. 31f.

for lack of frontier preachers; (2) opposition to itineracy; (3) aversion to revivalism; and perhaps most basic of all, (4) the structural peculiarities of the Episcopal church in its organization on the principle of the autonomy and self-sufficiency of the state bodies. This meant that as new states were formed, the Church, instead of sending out missionaries from established dioceses to build up churches, must wait until struggling groups of Episcopalians found the strength to support and call their own pastors and bishops. [1] The Church was too loose a federation, not an effective unit, and lost a whole generation of pioneers before it shook itself free of its constitutional handicaps. The result of the delay can still be seen in the fact that the present center of Episcopalian population is 600 miles east of the center of general population. [2]

But there were in the Church hardy souls who rose above all handicaps to bring "evangelical truth and apostolic order" to the frontier, free-lance ministerial pioneers, supporting themselves, ignoring diocesan boundaries. Outstanding among them were Philander Chase, who carried the Church to the new states of Ohio and Illinois, and James Harvey Otey, who carried it to Tennessee.

Chase left a comfortable living in Connecticut in 1817 to plunge into the Ohio wilderness, preaching from hamlet to hamlet whether he found Episcopalians or not. In 1818 a little group of three clergy and eight laymen elected him bishop. [3] In Ohio, before moving on to Michigan

---

1. "Knoxville, Tenn., for instance, had a population of 2000 when it received its first Episcopalian missionary, and so had Detroit. The first minister who went to St. Louis found a village of 5000 to 6000 inhabitants. In 1830 missionaries were requested for New Albany, Ind., which had a population of 3700, and Madison, which had 5500. In such communities... the Methodists and Baptists usually, and the Presbyterians frequently, had arrived before it, and had claimed the greater part of the church-going population." Manross, Episcopal Church...1800-1840, op. cit., p. 108

2. Ibid, p. 109

3. Perry, op. cit., pp. 225-6. McConnell, p. 303, counts 5 clergy and 6 laymen. The discrepancy is probably due to the fact that some of the "clergy" were not in full orders.

he founded Kenyon College. From Michigan, in 1835, he pushed on to Illinois where he was again elected bishop (bishop over four presbyters, one church building, and 39 communicants!)[1] and founded another college.

In the same spirit James Otey who had been baptized in frontier Tennessee by a passing minister, sought ordination in North Carolina and returned to the frontier as an Episcopal clergyman to a state that had no Episcopalian congregation.[2] People came out of curiosity "to hear the Episcopal minister pray, and his wife jaw back at him" in the responses.[3] Undaunted by ridicule he stuck to his task, and his great strength and evident sincerity soon won him followers on the rude frontier. In 1833 he was chosen by a convention of five clergymen bishop of Tennessee.[4]

Others heard the call of foreign missions. Joseph Andrews, the first volunteer, went out in 1820 to Liberia, but died within a year.[5] In 1821 the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society was formed by the General Convention, and auxiliary [illegible] sprang up throughout the dioceses. It was not, however, until 1830 when J. J. Robertson sailed to Greece that the church's first permanent foreign mission was established.[6] In 1835 Henry Lockwood and Francis Haven sailed to China.[7]

But the double necessity of supporting a foreign missionary enterprise and of meeting the challenge of expanding home frontiers made all too apparent the administrative deficiencies of the Church's loose federation. At last in 1835 the Church shook off the restrictions of

---

1. Burleson, op. cit., p. 54
2. McConnell, op. cit., p. 308
3. Ibid, quoting Green, Life of Bishop Otey, p. 56
4. Ibid
5. Tiffany, op. cit, p. 446
6. Perry, op. cit., p. 242ff.
7. Tiffany, op. cit., p. 447

State autonomy and the rigid diocesan limitations of the episcopate by two epoch-making decisions. The General Convention of that year has been called the most momentous in the Church's history [1] because there for the first time (1) she ruled that the whole Church herself was the missionary society and refused to leave to scattered diocesan organizations a hit-or-miss support of foreign missions or home missions, and (2) created the missionary episcopate, proving that she had not forgotten the meaning of the term apostolic and electing missionary bishops to go forth like the apostles of old to build up churches and dioceses and not wait passively to be called. Without delay the House of Bishops chose Francis L. Hawks as Bishop of the Southwest, and Jackson Kemper as Bishop of Indiana and Missouri, and later of the Northwest. [2]

On September 25, 1835, Kemper was consecrated bishop by old Bishop White. The last of the old order laid his hands on the head of the first missionary bishop. It was White's last consecration; before the year was out he had died. But the old man had lived to see his Church rise reorganized out of the calamities of the Revolution; he had seen it spiritually requickened after its post-war collapse and stagnation; and now his last act was to bless the first of a new order that within five years was to settle 152 Episcopal ministers west of the Alleghanies, [3] and that by 1850 was solidly to establish the Protestant Episcopal Church in sixth place on the American religious scene. [4]

---

1. Burleson, op. cit., p. 48ff.; Perry, op. cit., p. 245f; General Convention, Journal, 1835 (N.Y., 1835), pp. 129ff.

2. Burleson, op. cit., p. 60

3. It was high time. "This (152) was just two more ministers than the Baptist Church had in the state of Missouri alone." Manross, Episcopal Church...1800-1840, op. cit., p. 68.

4. See Appendix, p. 25

APPENDIX: Standings of the leading Christian Churches in America.

1

1776	Denomination	Ministers	Churches
1.	Congregational	575	700
2.	Baptist	350	385
3.	Church of England	250	300
4.	Presbyterian	153	320
5.	Dutch Reformed	25	60
6.	Lutheran	25	60
7.	German Reformed	25	60
8.	Roman Catholic	26	52

2

1850	Denomination	"Accommodations"	Churches
1.	Methodist	4,345,519	13,302
2.	Baptist	3,247,069	9,376
3.	Presbyterian	2,079,765	4,826
4.	Congregational	807,335	1,725
5.	Roman Catholic	667,863	1,222
6.	Episcopal	643,598	1,459
7.	Lutheran	539,701	1,231

3

1926	Denomination	Members	Churches
1.	Roman Catholic	18,605,003	18,940
2.	Methodist	6,568,471	44,226
3.	Baptist	4,814,344	30,995
4.	Lutheran	4,355,367	16,053
5.	Presbyterian	2,345,073	12,416
6.	Episcopal	1,859,086	7,[illegible]9
7.	Disciples of Christ	1,377,585	7,648
8.	Congregational	881,696	5,028

The tables are obviously not exactly equivalent. Membership of the churches of 1776 is not available, and for 1850 must be computed by the number of "accommodations" or sittings in the churches for purposes of comparison. The relative standing of the churches, however, is probably fairly accurately portrayed by these tables.

---

1. L. A. Weigle, American Idealism, op. cit., p.

2. Manross, Episcopal Church...1800-1840, op. cit., p. 238, from Census of Religious Bodies, 1916 (Washington, 1919), p. 24

3. Ibid, from Census of Religious Bodies, 1926 (Washington 1930), pp. 92-106, 278-86.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

C. R. Batchelder, A History of the Eastern Diocese. Claremont, N.H. 1876

Beardsley, E. E., The History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut from the Settlement of the Colony to the Death of Bishop Seabury. New York, 1865

Beardsley, E. E., Life and Correspondence of the Rt. Rev. Samuel Seabury D.D. Boston, 1881

Burleson, H. L., The Conquest of the Continent. Milwaukee, 1917

Greenwood, F.W.P. A History of King's Chapel in Boston; the First Episcopal Church in New England. Boston, 1833

Dorchester, D. Christianity in the United States from the First Settlement down to the Present Time. New York, 1888

Hodges, Three Hundred Years of the Episcopal Church in America. Philadelphia, 1906

McConnell, S. D., History of the American Episcopal Church. New York, 1890

Manross, W. W. The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1800-1840. New York, 1988

Manross, W. W. A History of the American Episcopal Church. New York, 1935

Meade, William Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia, vol. 1 Philadelphia, 1878

Perry, W. S. The History of the American Episcopal Church. vol. 2 Boston, 1885

Stowe, W. H. Life and Letters of Bishop William White. New York, 1937

Tiffany, C. C. History of the Protestant Episcopal Church, American Church History Series, vol. 7. New York, 1895

Weigle, L. A. American Idealism, Pageant of America Series, vol. 10 New Haven, 1928

White, William Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. New York, 1880

Wilson, Bird Memoir of the Life of the Rt. Rev. William White, D.D. Philadelphia, 1839

General Convention, Journals. 1784-1789

Living Church Annual, 1885

END.

But I'm afraid I've talked too much and obscured my real points with many word. Remember we're dealing with foundations, not superstructures.

So forget all, and remember this:

First--Job is more basic to Romans because it is the basic question to these basic principles of Romans:
1. Righteousness of God
2. Salvation of Man.

Second--Job is more basic to Romans because Romans is the direct answer to Job's profound question.

Let us look at the question from the affirmative standpoint. Job 9: is more basic to Romans than Hab, because The question of Job is more basic. Look at eh background: Job is just beginning to realize that he must turn from his own righteousness to God's righteousness. Tormented by the knowledge of his utter sinfulness he sends the cry ringing down through the ages How shall a man be just with God. (1) Restated it is the question: How can sinful man be saved by a righteous God. This is the cry of all men in all ages. All religions attack the question and fail. Man is not righteous. Read the first three chapter of Paul and you'll never question this fact. Job's question is the question of all mankind; it is the basic question of our faith. It is the question of salvation.

Are you saying, but this is not the question of salvation, it is the question of justification? Very well, analyze the problem of salvation just as Paul analyzes it in Romans. First you have the unrighteousness (2) of man. Paul takes his first three chapters to prove this. We saw it was basic. Now look at Job. His cry is the cry of a man who has just recognized his unrighteousness. Our verse deals with unrighteousness first.

Next in the analysis of Salvation is ~~zhexaxexxixaxaxfx~~ God's righteousness. Paul brings in this as the answer to Job's question in the (3) great passage at the end of the third verse.D. Dr. Stone has called it the core of Romans. Note well that the core of Romans is the answer to Job9:2.

Now Job asks, what is the relation between sinful man and righteous God--how shall a man be just before God. And again we look to Romans for an answer--this time in the fifth chapter, as well as the third. How shall a man be just before God: By the righteousness of Christ imputed to him, and received by faith. Job 9: 2 then is rightly the question of Salvation in a nutshell. Let me quote from Hodge, Systematic Theology, page 15?. "The question How shall a man be just (4) before God must be answered or there can be no salvation." I want you to see the basic nature of this question. Is there anything more basic to Christianity than Salvation. Nothing. Well, right here is the basic question of Salvation--How shall a man be just before God. Romans has been called the most profound book in the ~~W~~ world. And why? Because it deals with a profound subject--the basis of Salvation. We have proved therefore that Job 9:2 is the most basic question of ~~WwwxzxrnxfxxxxfwbxzxzXaXaXXXZ~~ Christianity.

~~Our second point needs no proof. Paul recognized the basic nature of this question, because his epistle to the Romans is the answer to this question. And because the foundation of the epistle, his opening chapters. I ll deal directly with the problem.~~

~~We have proved~~ that

Parenthetical y to my argument may I note the point that Habakkuk deals with the things of men--the just shall live by faith. It is an exposition on the Christian life. Whereas Job deas with man and God. The justification of man shows that God is just. And that this is basic, may I point out that no less an authority than Dr. Geerhardus Vos of Princeton says "the primary purpose of the Atonement was not to save man, but to Justify God." And Job's question is the question, How can God be just, in justifying sinful (5) man. So the problem of Job, is not only the problem of Salvation, but it is also the problem so closely associated to Salvation, the problem that is considered even more basic, the problem of the Righteousness of God. Where does the simple statement, "The just shall live by faith" touch on the righteousness of God, save superficially by inference, if at all. And Dr. Stone has called The Righteousness of God the keythought of Romans. Again Job is the more basic to Romans.

We have proved now that Job is the most basic question of Christianity. We shall later show that Habakkuk 2:4 is not concerned with this question of the justification of sinful man by righteous God, it does not state the problem of salvation, but proceeds as a consequence of ~~fact that they~~ The just shall live by faith. is a result of the salvation of the sinner. It is no statement of the ~~x~~ basic problem of Salvation. And since Job is the most basic question it is more basic than Hab. ~~x~~ I have also shown that Paul realized the basic nature of the question. And now I shall prove that Job. is not only more basic, but it is more basic to Romans.

(6)

Job has been called the oldest book in the Bible. This cry of his then is one of the oldest cries of man--the cry for justification, for salvation. It rings all through the old Testament. And there we have only hints at the answer. Job shows us that it is by the righteousness of God, but does not tell us how. Paul quotes a passage from Gen. to show that Abraham was counted righteous for his ~~x~~ belief. But all these are mere hints. Even the gospels give us little more than hints.

(7)

But ~~x~~ this question that had baffled the ages little daunted the greatest mind the church has known. Romans was written to answer, once and for all Job's question: How shall a man be just with God. And what is Paul's answer--by the righteousness of God. I have showed before that an analysis of Romans is an analysis of this verse--it must deal with man's unrighteousness; God's righteousness; and Christ's righteousness imputed to sinners.

(8)

Perhaps you're saying--very well, but what about the rest of Romans-what about chapters 9,10 and 11 and the Jewish problem; what about chapter 8 and Glorification and Sanctification; what about the practical instructions in the latter part of Romans. Are these the answers to ~~x~~ Job. I might hint here that these questions are somewhat irrelevant. The nature of the question requires us to dig down into the profundities of Romans and find its basic tenet--which is the Righteousness of God for Men~~x~~, as Dr. Stone states. And this is the answer to Job, not a statement from Habakkuk.

(9)

But let us turn for a moment from the foundation to the superstructure. ~~x~~ Take chapters 9,10 and 11 deal with the Jewish problem, and this problem has been called by our instructor A National Problem in Salvation. We have already shown that Job's question is basic to Salvation, so it is also basic to chapters 9,10 and 11. Chapter 8 and Sanctification and Glorification are out results proceeding from and following Justification. Again justification is more basic, and Job 9:2 is Justification. The same argument applies to the latter chapters. Of what use are Paul's exhortations to right conduct if man is not justified by God's righteousness. Here again the basis of our Christian life is Job 9:2. Paul recognized this. He established Justification and the means of Salvation first before he attempted to deal with the Christian life. It cannot be denied that the basis of <u>all</u> of Romans is the question--How shall a man be just with God.

(10)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Holy Bible

Lectures on Romanism - J. F. Berg

Systematic Theology (V.3) - Charles Hodge

Debate on Roman Catholicism - Alexander Campbell

sin is blotted out [illegible] the blood of Christ. Of course the unbelieving sinner cannot enter heaven, but the need is for mercy. The Christian is not guilty. In the 3rd chapter of 1 John Paul's friend says, "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Calvary is sufficient, and the propitiation is sufficient. The sacrifice of Christ was all-sufficient.

The second article, that of infallibility, bites at one of the dearest rights of the Christian liberty [illegible] which God according to the dictates of his conscience. All men are the Lord's. His commands are His Word. But in speaking of His infallibility, ignoring the prerogative of declaring the believer what is right and what is wrong, the Roman church assumes infallibility in one of three ways, either through the Pope, the papal synods, or the Roman church which is a whole. But what does Paul say, "There is one mediator, [illegible], [illegible] Jesus," not the Holy Church Council, not the Pope, not the Holy Catholic Church, but Christ Jesus Himself. We condemn [illegible] equally as much in our terms. "Whosoever [illegible] right is, [illegible] to... Right [illegible] that [illegible], [illegible] is one."

The Catholic [illegible] the Church [illegible] for [illegible] with [illegible] infallible [illegible] in matters [illegible] the [illegible]. In the [illegible] the Pope is infallible, and God's infallible [illegible] the Scriptures [illegible] the Pope, which

[illegible] Paul invites [illegible] "the spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" and [illegible] "and if children, then heirs; for we [illegible] ."

Another [illegible] which is their doctrine of implicit faith, which teaches that faith without doubt is assuring and sufficient, distinguishing between explicit and implicit faith. To [illegible] that their priesthood withholds [illegible] for knowledge is not necessary; that they [illegible] an [illegible] argued: that [illegible] leads to blind ignorance, which is sufficient. Further [illegible] Roman Catholic [illegible] based on this basis, a mystic ignorant unbelief kept by the [illegible] only by the ritual [illegible] holding with [illegible] an implicit faith.

[illegible] is according to [illegible] Paul's definition. His [illegible] faith [illegible] finds in his knowledge of Christ and [illegible] a blind belief without [illegible] the [illegible] says, "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard." And again in the 17th verse, "So then faith [illegible] hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ."

[illegible] for righteousness." (Rom. 4:3,?) [illegible] f
[illegible] is the fact that Paul teaches justification by faith (Rom.
1.17) whereas the Roman church bases [illegible] the scriptural grounds of justification by works.

Justification by faith; Christ's sacrifice for our sins; universal condemnation; freedom of the believer; the witness of the Holy Spirit; faith based on knowledge; it is by these great principles established in Paul's epistle to the Romans that Roman Catholic's stands condemned.

ROMAN HISTORIANS

ON THE REPUBLICAN PERIOD

Roman History
Sam H. Moffett
May 31, 1937

HISTORIANS OF REPUBLICAN ROME

It is a keen criticism of early Roman historians that the most reliable record of ancient Roman history was written by a Greek.

There is one great vice that is evident throughout, a tendency to subordinate truth to what was supposed to be for the interest of the state, or for the education of the individual. For the pride of the early Romans led them both to falsify their own history, and to take some measures to preserve the memory of it.[1]

From the annals, brief notices of important events in connection with the names of officials for each year; from the commentaries of priestly colleges explaining priestly rituals and ceremonies; from funerary inscriptions and orations; and from monumentary inscriptions comes the scanty historical material on ancient Rome before the close of the third century B.C. Authorship of the earliest annals is anonymous, but from the second century B.C., the most re-

---

1. R. Flint - Philosophy of History in Europe - p.57

annals were kept by the Roman Pontiffs, and in the time of the Gracchi, the Pontifex Maximus recorded on a tablet the important events of the year. These records were known as the Annales Maximi. Early laws and treaties were engraved upon stone. However, the Romans paid little attention to the preservation of their documents, and with the sack of Rome by the Gauls in 387 B.C. was destroyed what little historic source material that may have existed.[2]

It may be seen that there was no real history of Rome until Quintus Fabius Pictor wrote his Annals at the close of the Second Punic War. Pictor, who lived about the middle of the third century, B.C., is called the father of Roman history. Little is known of him, save that he was active in subjugating the Gauls in the north of Italy in 225 B.C., and that after the bloody battle of Cannae he was sent to Greece to consult the Delphic oracle. He served with distinction in the second Punic War.[2]

For his sources, Pictor drew upon the inscribed laws, treaties and senatus consulta that then existed. He consulted the annual priestly records of important events that required thank-offerings and atonements, the tablets containing lists of magistrates from the early republic, family records,

- -

1. Arthur Boak - History of Rome to 565 A.D. - p. xvii-xviii

2. Ibid
Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v.9, p.20

inscriptions on public buildings, records of the early colonies, and oral tradition.[1]

Excavations indicate that his records from the early republican period are sound, but his account of the regal period is only traditional and legendary, as Roman historians assumed it was. Livy quotes him as an authority frequently, saying in one place, "I would rather believe Fabius, apart from his greater antiquity, than Piso."[2]

Three other men are named with Fabius as early historians of note, Cincius, Acilius and Postumius. All were statesmen who wrote with a keen sense of responsibility. None of their works are extant. A fourth historian was L. Caelius Antipater, contemporary of C. Gracchus, who wrote on the Second Punic War, and is quoted by Livy as an authority on Hannibal.[3]

All of these works were in Greek, but in 168 or thereabouts appeared the first historical work in Latin prose, the Origins of Marcus Porcius Cato, called the Elder. This book was written with the Roman conception of history which regarded actions and events solely as they affected the continuous and progressive life of the state. It contained the early history of the Italian communities which the Romans had conquered, and covered the period from the opening of the Punic Wars to 149 B.C.

---

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v. 19, p.509

2. Ibid - Fabius - v. 14, p.249
   Livy - i, 44

3. Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v. 19, p. 509

The seven books of the Origins are not extant. Cato was a famous Roman statesman, often called the Censor, because of his severity in fulfilling the duties of that office. He opposed the spread of luxury and extravagance, served in the Carthaginian campaigns, and in Spain and Syria, as a military tribune against Antiochus III.[1]

Writers of lesser note of the time of Cato the Elder were Calpurnius Piso, Cassius Hemina, Tuditanus, and Fannius. The latter wrote of the Gracchi, and on the whole all were well-informed and confined themselves to contemporary events.[2]

Shortly after this, Polybius, the Greek, wrote the most accurate and reliable history of Rome written in early times. Polybius was born in Megalapolis, youngest of the great Greek cities about 210-204 B.C. and lived to the age of 82. His father Lycortas was the leader of the Achaean League in 189. In 181 B.C. Polubius advised the Achaean League to ally openly with Rome against Perseus of Macedon. He was then its trusted adviser. After the Roman victory in Greece, Polybius was arrested with 1000 Achaeans, and taken to Italy, but was privileged to remain in Rome. There he became the tutor and lifelong friend of Scipio Africanus, the younger, and his brother Fabius. This friendship opened the highest circles of Roman society to him. He was an eye-witness of

---

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Cato - v. 5, pp. 43-44
   Arthur Boak - History of Rome - p. xix

2. Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v. 19, p. 509

Scipio's siege and destruction of Carthage. During his absence on this expedition, the Achaeans had their last rash stand, were defeated, and Corinth was destroyed. Polybius used all his influence to save his fellow-countrymen from the consequences, and earned their lasting gratitude. His last public work was that entrusted to him by the Romans, of reconciling the Achaeans to the new regime of Roman sovreignty.[1]

His History was written in forty books, of which only five remain complete. There are copious fragments of the others extant. His purpose was to explain how and why "all the known regions of the civilized world had fallen under the sway of Rome"[2] He wrote of Rome as the wonder of the age and asked, "Who is so indolent or poor-spirited as not to wish to know by what means, and thanks to what sort of constitution the Romans subdued the world in less than 53 years."[3]

The main portion of his Histories covers these 53 years from 220 to 168 B.C., the outbreak of the Hannibalic War to the defeat of Perseus at Pydna. He later extended the history to 146 B.C. to include the fall of Carthage and the annexation of Greece.[4]

Polybius was called the most reliable, but not the most brilliant of ancient historians. His method included

---

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Polybius - v. 22, p. 10 (11th Ed.)
2. Polybius - Histories - iii, 1
3. Ibid - i, 1
4. The New Larned History - v. 5, p. 1076
   Encyclopedia Britannica - Polybius - v. 22, p. 10 (11th Ed.)

two principles, the synoptic, which gave a comprehensive view of the whole course of events, and the pragmatic, which dealt with events and causes, the how and why. He considered that the great work of history was to instruct through light cast upon human life. His analysis of Roman government as a combination of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, is famous. He was noted in ancient times for his accuracy, not his literary style, and for his painstaking research among records, archives, monuments and original documents, and for his study of geographic and topographic details.[1]

In the age that followed these early writers a new tendency appeared in Roman historical material, the tendency to distort early accounts of Roman history that they might appear on a par with Rome's later greatness. Emphasis was laid, not on accuracy of detail, but on rhetorical eloquence and an ornamental style. Three of these historical romanticists may be noted.[2]

Gnaeus Gellius, after the time of the Gracchi, was the first who sought to embellish and enliven the dry annals of historic events by inserting various family legends. He was followed by Claudius Quadrigarius, a diffuse and rhetorical writer, who composed popular accounts of Roman

---

1. Library of Original Sources - Polybius on the Constitution - p. 166-172, v.iii
   Boak - History of Rome - p. 130
   Encyclopedia Britannica - Polybius - v.22, p.18, (17th Ed.)

2. Boak - History of Rome - p. xix
   Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v.19, p.509

history with little regard to accuracy. During the same period numerous apologetic biographies appeared, along with memoirs, political pamphlets, and unduly colored accounts of later Rome.[1]

The chief representative of the rhetorical historians was Valerius Antias. Livy rates him in a sentence, "Valerius, who extravagantly exaggerates the number of everything."[2]

The works of all the above authors exist only in fragments, or brief epitomes of mediaeval authors, save for the Histories of Polybius.

Historians of the Ciceronian age were famed for their work in antiquarian research. The object of this was to explain the origin of ancient Roman customs, ceremonies, institutions, monuments, and legal formulae, and of establishing early Roman chronology.[3]

Two valuable pamphlets of the amateur historian Sallust are extant, his Account of the Catiline Conspiracy, and Jugurthine War. Flint says of Sallust, "He may be described as the first artistic historian, or historical artist of Rome"[4] He took Thucydides as a model for his Histories, a partisan account of Roman history, which exists only in fragments. He

---

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v.19, p.509
2. Livy - History of Rome - xxxiii. 10
3. Boak - History of Rome - p. xix
4. R. Flint - Philosophy of History in Europe - p. 57

was born of a well-known plebeian family, and became a partisan of Caesar, accompanying him on his African campaign. He later won notoriety as the oppressive governor of Numidia. In all his works he is strongly pro-Caesar, emphasizing the feebleness of the Senate. His chronological and geographic details are unsatisfactory and unreliable.[1]

Julius Caesar himself, in addition to his political and military triumphs, left his mark as a historian. His Commentario de bello Gallico is a classic of historical simplicity and accuracy, giving a first-hand account of the subdual of Gaul. His De bello civili is written from a more partial viewpoint. Its veracity has been questioned. Flint says of Caesar and Sallust, "They were the first to produce works displaying historical genius."[2]

The other side of the Civil War politically is admirably portrayed in the speeches and correspondence of Marcus Tullius Cicero. His letters throw much light on the background of the period.

The work of the Ciceronian antiquarians, Varro, Pomponius and Atticus enabled later writers to correct the works of their predecessors. They were tireless in their research. Marcus Terentius Varro was not only the most learned of the Romans, but also the most voluminous. His books number 620,

- -

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Sallust - v. 19, p. 888

2. Ibid - Caesar - v. 5, p. 17
   P. Flint - Philosophy of History in Europe - p. 57

and his separate literary works 74. Politically he followed Pompey, but was friendly to Caesar, and after Caesar's accession to power he assisted him in his project of collecting for a great public library. Cicero pays tribute to him, "He revealed the age of our fatherland, its chronology, laws of its religion and priesthood, the plan of our home and foreign administration, the position of our territories....."[1] However, his History, of 41 books, 25 of which concern human antiquities, and 16 divine antiquities, is simply an amassing of unconnected, curious facts. [2]

Titus Pomponius Atticus, another antiquarian, was educated with Cicero, and achieved fame as a Roman patron of letters. As a young man he moved to Athens to escape the civil war, and there he devoted himself to study. Upon his return to Rome, he kept himself free from political strife, though he was intimate with such antagonistic men as Caesar, Pompey, Antony and Octavian, as well as his greatest friend, Cicero. None of his writings are extant, but mention is made of two, a Greek history of Cicero's consulship, and his Annals, forming a history of Rome, in epitome, to 54 B.C. He was instrumental in preserving an edition of Cicero's letters.[3]

Historians of the Augustan age were largely

---

1. Cicero - Acad. post. - i. 3
2. Encyclopedia Britannica - v. v. 20, p. 546
3. Ibid - v. 2, p. 661

concerned with compiling and editing materials accumulated by early historians. It is for the most part through the efforts of these historians that the works of their predecessors have been preserved.[1]

Greatest of them all was the writer, Livy. Little is known of his life, save that he was a friend of Augustus in spite of his Pompeian tendencies. His monumental History of Rome summarized the story of Rome from the arrival of Aeneas to the death of Drusus, younger brother of Tiberius, in 9 A.D. Of the 142 books supposed to have been written, only 35, with inconsiderable fragments, are in existence. They include the first ten, from the founding of the city to the close of the third Samnite war, and books 20 to 45, covering Roman history from the Second Punic War to the triumph of Aemilius Paulus over Macedonia, 167 B.C.

Modern criticism has detracted much from Livy's reputation as a historian. His reliability has been questioned, not that he deliberately misstated, but it has been said that he was not critical of his authorities, failed to check with official records and monumental evidence, and made no study of topography.[2]

But there is much to offset his lack of research and many inaccuracies. His way of thinking was pictorial. His historical view was not of a series of events in orderly arrange-

- -

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v. 19, p. 509

2. Ibid - Livy - v. 14, p. 241-243
   Livy - Books XXI and XXII - Introduction p. v-xxi - John Lord.

ment, but of a succession of pictures. He had an enthusiasm for his subject, and identified himself as a participant in the scenes he described. What he lacked in analysis of cause and effect, he made up for by his mastery of style. He was at his best in the delineation of character, the exhibition of motives and the portrayal of feelings. Quintilian (x. i. 32) speaks of the "milky richness of Livy. And though he has suffered by modern criticism, in antiquity he had the reputation of conspicuous honesty and impartiality.[1]

Livy's purpose was educational, and ethical rather than political, hence his tendency to moralize. This is evident in his preface, "These things to which I would have everyone bend his keen attention are:--what Roman life and character have been; then what men and by what arts the empire has been extended.....; how, as discipline gradually relaxed, character first...declined, then lapsed....until we reached these last days when we can endure neither our vices nor their remedies."[2]

Diodorus Siculus, Greek historian in the time of Caesar and Augustus, had Livy's faults with little of his better traits. His Bibliotheca historica was written in forty books in three parts. The first part treats of mythic history of non-Hellenic and Hellenic tribes to the destruction of Troy. The second takes him to Alexander's death, and the third to the beginning of

---

1. John K. Lord - Livy Book XXI and XXII - Introduction - p. v-xxi
   Encyclopedia Britannica - Livy - v. 14, p.241-243

2. Livy - Preface to Book I

Caesar's Gallic War. Of these exist only the first five books, the 10th to the 20th covering Greece from the Persian War to the death of Alexander, and the rest only in fragments. He adopted a dry annalistic form, lacked the critical faculty, and repeats and contradicts himself, but his Bibliotheca is of value in supplying the loss of works of earlier authors, Castor, Ephorus, and Appollodorus.[1]

Another contemporary of Livy was Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Greek historian and teacher of rhetoric in the reign of Augustus. He went to Rome after the civil wars and spent 22 years preparing the materia for his history. Roman Antiquities, his great work, follows Livy, and gives the history of Rome from the mythical period to the beginning of the First Punic War. Of the 20 books, nine are entire, the 10th and 11th nearly complete, and the rest in fragments. His chief object was to reconcile Greece to Roman rule by enlarging upon the good qualities of its conquerors. His work, with Livy's, are the only connected and detailed accounts of early Rome still in existence.[2]

Four minor historians of the Augustan period are worthy of note for their accounts of Republican Rome. Trogus Pompeius wrote a Universal History known to us by an epitome of Justin, 2nd century A.D. Strabo, who wrote the most important work on Geography in antiquity, was also the author of a continuation of the history of Polybius to 27 B.C.

- -

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - v. 7, p.394 - Diodorus Siculus

2. Boak - History of Rome - p. xix
   Encyclopedia Britannica - Dionysius - v.7, p.397

These Historical Memoirs are now lost. Valerius Flaccus enshrined the learning of his time in an encyclopedia, which survives through an abridgement of Festus in the 2nd century A.D., and an epitome of Festus. The Universal History of Juba, learned king of Mauretania is also lost. He was the son of Juba I, the king of Mauretania who sided with Pompey and was defeated at Thapsus, gracing Caesar's triumph. Augustus married Juba II to the daughter of Antony and Cleopatra, and placed him on his father's throne. He was called the African Varro, and was the author of numerous historical and geographical works.[1]

Writers of the Imperial period who treated of the Republican era are of little importance. About 36 B.C. an official list of the consuls and other chief magistrates of the country was inscribed on the walls of the Regia(rebuilt 36 B.C.), and this was followed by a somewhat similar list of triumphatores. Fragments of the former list are preserved.[2]

In the Imperial period, Velleius Paterculus wrote a compendium of Roman history, about 30 A.D. Plutarch worked up some historical material in his biographies, but from the historians point of view the chief weakness of his work is that their interest is primarily ethical. Plutarch received

---

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v. 19, p. 509
   Ibid - Juba - v. 13, p. 627

2. Ibid - Rome - v. 19, p.509

consular rank from Trajan, and under Hadrian was appointed procurator of Greece.[1]

Appian described the wars of the Republic under geographic headings, and treated of the civil war in five books. Parts of the former books are preserved. He lived under Trajan, Hadrian and Antonius Pius in Rome and Alexandria. His History, 24 books in Greek, was a number of monographs, not a connected history. His style was unattractive, the the History is valuable especially for the period of the civil wars. In the Review of Roman Contentions he describes the basis of contentions between the plebs and the Senate.[2]

A final important authority for the last years of the republic and the early empire is Dio Cassius, son of the governor of Dalmatia and Cilicia during the time of Marcus Aurelius. He won his seat in the Senate under Commodus, practiced as an advocate, and held the offices of aedile and quaestor. By Pertinax he was raised to the praetorship, and became an intimate friend of Septimus Severus. He was consul under Macrinus, and obtained the proconsulship of Africa.

In 80 volumes, the covered the History of Rome from the landing of Aeneas to the reign of Alexander Severus. Books 36-60 are extant, parts of 35, and books 80-80 exist in

---

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Rome - v. 19, p. 509
   Ibid - Plutarch - v. 18, pp. 90-91
2. Library of Original Sources - Apians Review of Roman Contentions - Civil Wars Int. - pp. 5-8
   Encyclopedia Britannica - Apian - v. 2, p. 187

an epitome of Xiphitinus, and 11th century monk. The many offices he held gave him an unparalleled opportunity for historical investigation. His narrative shows the hand of a soldier and politician, but is not remarkable for impartiality or critical historical faculty.[1]

These then are the writer of Rome who treated of the Republican period. Rare, but most reliable are the meagre annalistic narratives of the early historians. Polybius and Diodorus are the most valuable, in that they reflect early sources with apparent accuracy, and are better preserved than the average. The chief criticism of the later writers is that they were too lax in their critical appraisal of their sources. From these fragmentary, diffuse, inaccurate accounts, it is the task of the modern historian to reconstruct the rise of the Roman Republic.

---

1. Encyclopedia Britannica - Dio Cassius - v. 7, p.803

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Encyclopedia Britannica (14th Ed.), Selections
Volumes 3, 5, 7, 9
Volumes 13, 14, 18, 19
Volume 20

Encyclopedia Britannica (14th Ed.), Selection
Volume 22

The New Larned History - v. 5, Selections

Library of Original Sources - v. 3, Selections

R. Flint - Philosophy of History in Europe - p. 57-59

John C. Lord - Livy Books XXI and XXII, with Introduction.

Polybius - Histories - quotations

Arthur Boak - History of Rome to 565 A.D. -

CURATORES ET PROFESSORES

SCHOLAE THEOLOGICAE PRINCETONIENSIS

AB ECCLESIA PRESBYTERIANA CONDITAE

OMNIBUS HAS LITTERAS LECTURIS

SALUTEM IN DOMINO NOSTRO IESU CHRISTO

CUM NOBIS IUS NON MODO SACRAS LITTERAS DOCENDI SED ETIAM AD GRADUS SACRAE THEOLOGIAE PROMOVENDI AUCTORITATE REI PUBLICAE NEOCAESARIENSIS CONCESSUM SIT CUMQUE CANDIDATUS

SAMUEL HUGH MOFFETT

VIR VITA INCULPATUS FIDE CHRISTIANUS LITTERIS INSTRUCTUS HUMANIORIBUS STUDIIS THEOLOGICIS IMBUTUS SE IUSTO EXAMINE CORAM NOBIS HABITO DIGNUM HONORE PUBLICO ESSE DEMONSTRAVERIT IDCIRCO NOTUM SIT QUOD SUPRADICTUM CANDIDATUM SACRAE

THEOLOGIAE BACCALAUREUM

CREARI VOLUIMUS CUIUS REI HAEC MEMBRANA SIGILLO SCHOLAE NOSTRAE RATA ET NOMINIBUS PRAESIDUM NOSTRORUM MUNITA TESTIMONIO SIT DATUM PRINCETONIAE MAII XIX, MCMXLII

PROFESSORUM PRAESES

John A. Mackay

CURATORUM PRAESES